

## CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION – SIGNATURE PAGE

The State of Arizona hereby requests funds as authorized by section 9302 of the ESEA for the programs selected and identified on the “List of Programs Included in this Consolidated Application.”

<p>1. Legal name of Applicant Agency (State Educational Agency):  <b>Arizona Department of Education</b></p>	<p>2. D.U.N.S. number: <b>866004791</b></p> <p>Taxpayer ID Number (TIN): <b>866004791</b></p>
<p>3. Address (include zip):  <b>1535 W. Jefferson  Bin #28  Phoenix, AZ 85007</b></p>	<p>4. Contact Person for Consolidated Application  Name: <b>Julie Gasaway</b></p> <p>Position: <b>Director of Educational Programs</b></p> <p>Telephone: <b>(602) 364-1973</b></p> <p>Fax: <b>(602) 542-3359</b></p> <p>E-Mail: <b>jgasawa@ade.az.gov</b></p>
<p>5. Is the applicant delinquent on any Federal debt? <u>    X    </u> No</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><u>                    </u> Yes, explanation attached.</p>	
<p>6. By signing this consolidated State application, the State certifies the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The following assurances and certifications covering the programs included in this Consolidated State Application have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR</u>. The assurances in Section 9304 (a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR)</li> <li>ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing any program included in this Application.</li> <li>iii. <u>Assurances and Certifications</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under “Assurances and Certifications.”</li> <li>iv. <u>Crosscutting</u>. As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs).</li> <li>v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace</u>. The three certifications in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).)</li> </ul> </li> <li>b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts have changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.</li> </ul>	
<p>7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certifications provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.</p>	
<p>a. Printed Name and Title of Authorized State/SEA Representative:  <b>Jaime A. Molera  Superintendent of Public Instruction</b></p>	<p>b. Telephone: <b>(602) 542-5460</b></p> <p>Fax: <b>(602) 542-5440</b></p> <p>E-Mail: <b>jmolera@ade.az.gov</b></p>
<p>c. Signature of Authorized State/SEA Representative:</p>	<p>d. Date:</p>

# SAFE DRUG-FREE SCHOOLS AND COMMUNITIES ACT STATE GRANTS

## Chief Executive Officer Cover Sheet

<p>1. Legal Name of Applicant Agency (Chief Executive Office): <b>Office of the Governor Governor's Community Policy Office</b></p>	<p>2. DUNS Number: <b>DUNS/SSN: 072459266</b></p>
<p>3. Address (including zip code): <b>1700 W. Washington St., Suite 101 Phoenix, AZ 85007</b></p>	<p>4. Contact Person Name: <b>Lyra McCoy</b>  Position: <b>Program Administrator, Governor's Division of Drug Policy</b>  Telephone: <b>(602) 542-6005</b>  Fax: <b>(602) 542-3643</b>  E-Mail Address: <b>lmccoy@az.gov</b></p>
<p>5. Reservation of Funds:  <u>20</u> % Indicate the amount the Governor wishes to reserve (up to 20%) of the total State SDFSCA State Grant allocation.</p>	
<p>6. By signing this form the Governor certifies the following: a. The following assurances and certifications covering the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program have been filed with the U.S. Department of Education (either as a part of this Application or through another submission from the State): i. <u>Section 14303 and EDGAR</u>. The assurances in Section 9304(a) of the ESEA, and Section 76.104 of the Education Department General Administrative Regulations (EDGAR). ii. <u>ESEA Program Assurances</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the statutes governing the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Act State Grants program. iii. <u>Assurances and Certification</u>. Any assurances or certifications included in the Application under "Assurances and Certifications." iv. <u>Cross-Cutting</u>. As applicable, the assurances in OMB Standard Form 424B (Government-wide Assurances for Non-Construction Programs.)v. <u>Lobbying; debarment/suspension; drug-free workplace</u>. The three certification in ED Form 80-0013 and 80-0014, relating to lobbying, debarment/suspension, and drug-free workplace. (For more information, see 61 <i>Fed. Reg.</i> 1412 (01.19.96).) b. As of the date of submission of this Application, none of the facts has changed upon which those certifications and assurances were made.</p>	
<p>7. To the best of my knowledge and belief, all data are true and correct. The governing body of the applicant has duly authorized the document and the applicant will comply with the assurances and certification provided in this package if the assistance is awarded.</p>	
<p>8. Typed name of Chief Executive Officer  <b>Jane Dee Hull Governor</b></p>	<p>9. Telephone Number: <b>(602) 542-3456</b></p>
<p>10. Signature of Chief Executive Officer</p>	<p>11. Date</p>

**ESEA PROGRAMS INCLUDED IN  
THE CONSOLIDATED STATE APPLICATION**

**CHECKLIST**

The State of ARIZONA requests funds for the programs indicated below:

- ☒ Title I, Part A: Improving Basic Programs Operated by Local Educational Agencies
- ☒ Title I, Part B, Subpart 3: Even Start Family Literacy
- ☒ Title I, Part C: Education of Migrant Children
- ☒ Title I, Part D: Prevention and Intervention Programs for Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk
- ☒ Title I, Part F: Comprehensive School Reform
- ☒ Title II, Part A: Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund
- ☒ Title II, Part D: Enhancing Education Through Technology
- ☒ Title III, Part A: English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1: Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities
- ☒ Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2: Community Service Grants
- ☒ Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers
- ☒ Title V, Part A: Innovative Programs
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111: State Assessment Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6112: Enhanced Assessment Instruments Competitive Grant Program
- ☒ Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2: Rural and Low-Income Schools

## SEA CONTACTS FOR ESEA PROGRAMS

ESEA Program Title	SEA Program Contact		
	Name	Phone	E-Mail address
Title I, Part A	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title I, Part B, 3	Karen Liersch	(602)258-2410	<a href="mailto:kliersc@ade.az.gov">kliersc@ade.az.gov</a>
Title I, Part C	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title I, Part D	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title I, Part F	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title II, Part A	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title II, Part D	Chris Castillo	(602)542-5233	<a href="mailto:ccastil@ade.az.gov">ccastil@ade.az.gov</a>
Title III, Part A	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title IV, Part A (SEA)	Lynne Dulin	(602)542-8709	<a href="mailto:ldulin@ade.az.gov">ldulin@ade.az.gov</a>
Title IV, Part A (Governor)	Lyra McCoy	(602)542-6005	<a href="mailto:lmccoy@az.gov">lmccoy@az.gov</a>
Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2	Lynne Dulin	(602)542-8709	<a href="mailto:ldulin@ade.az.gov">ldulin@ade.az.gov</a>
Title IV, Part B	Lynne Dulin	(602)542-8709	<a href="mailto:ldulin@ade.az.gov">ldulin@ade.az.gov</a>
Title V, Part A	Kathryn Stevens	(602)542-4392	<a href="mailto:ksteven@ade.az.gov">ksteven@ade.az.gov</a>
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6111	David Garcia	(602)364-1955	<a href="mailto:dgarcia@ade.az.gov">dgarcia@ade.az.gov</a>
Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, 6112	David Garcia	(602)364-1955	<a href="mailto:dgarcia@ade.az.gov">dgarcia@ade.az.gov</a>
Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2	Ralph Romero	(602)542-7462	<a href="mailto:rromero@ade.az.gov">rromero@ade.az.gov</a>

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
<b>PART I: ESEA Goals, ESEA Indicators, State Performance Targets</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>PART II: State Activities to Implement ESEA Activities</b>	
<b>1. Describe the State’s system of standards, assessments and accountability</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>2. Describe the process for awarding competitive subgrants</b>	
<i>Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)</i>	12
<i>Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)</i>	14
<i>Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent,         or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)</i>	15
<i>Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)</i>	16
<i>Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—subgrants to eligible         partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)</i>	17
<i>Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)</i>	20
<i>Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities -- reservation for the Governor         (Title IV, Part A, section 4112).</i>	23
<i>Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126).</i>	25
<i>21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B)</i>	26
<b>3. Describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development     and technical assistance</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>4. Describe the Statewide system of support for academic content and student     achievement standards</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>5. Describe the activities</b>	
<i>Effective use of schoolwide programs</i>	34
<i>Teachers are highly qualified.</i>	35
<i>Paraprofessionals attain qualifications</i>	35
<i>LEAs form partnerships to improve the use of technology in instruction.</i>	36
<i>Promote parental and community participation in schools</i>	37
<i>Secure the baseline and follow-up data for accountability</i>	38
<b>6. Describe how:</b>	
<i>SEA consulted with the Governor’s office in the development of the plan</i>	40
<i>State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs         with State-level activities</i>	40
<i>State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations</i>	40
<i>State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies</i>	41
<b>7. Describe the strategies used to determine satisfactory progress in     meeting goals and desired program outcomes.</b>	<b>41</b>

### **PART III: ESEA KEY PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS AND FISCAL INFORMATION**

<i>Title I, Part A -- Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs</i>	43
<i>Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 -- Even Start Family Literacy</i>	45
<i>Title I, Part C -- Education of Migrant Children</i>	48
<i>Title I, Part D -- Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk</i>	51
<i>Title I, Part F -- Comprehensive School Reform</i>	53
<i>Title II, Part A -- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund</i>	54
<i>Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology</i>	56
<i>Title III, Part A -- English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement</i>	61
<i>Title IV, Part A -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities</i>	63
<i>Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, section 4112(a) -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor</i>	67
<i>Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126 -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants</i>	68
<i>Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers</i>	68
<i>Title V, Part A -- Innovative Programs</i>	69
<i>Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111 -- State Assessments Formula Grants</i>	71
<i>Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 -- Rural and Low-Income School Program</i>	71
 <b>GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427</b>	 72
 <b>Consolidated Administrative Funds</b>	 73
 <b>Assurances and Certifications</b>	 74
 <b>APPENDIX</b>	 82

# **PART I: ESEA GOALS, ESEA INDICATORS, STATE PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

**Arizona** has adopted the five goals and the corresponding indicators. Arizona agrees to submit targets and baseline data related to the goals and indicators identified in the application.

## **ESEA Goals and Indicators**

**Performance goal 1:** By 2013-2014, all students will reach high standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 1.1. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and for each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)
- 1.2. Performance indicator: The percentage of students, in the aggregate and in each subgroup, who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment. (Note: These subgroups are those for which the ESEA requires State reporting, as identified in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(i).)
- 1.3. Performance indicator: The percentage of Title I schools that make adequate yearly progress.

**Performance goal 2:** All limited English proficient students will become proficient in English and reach high academic standards, at a minimum attaining proficiency or better in reading/language arts and mathematics.

- 2.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students, determined by cohort, who have attained English proficiency by the end of the school year.
- 2.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in reading/language arts on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.1.
- 2.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of limited English proficient students who are at or above the proficient level in mathematics on the State's assessment, as reported for performance indicator 1.2.

**Performance goal 3:** By 2005-2006, all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers.

- 3.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of classes being taught by "highly qualified" teachers (as the term is defined in section 9101(23) of the ESEA), in the aggregate and in "high-poverty" schools (as the term is defined in section 1111(h)(1)(C)(viii) of the ESEA).

- 3.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of teachers receiving high-quality professional development. (as the term, “professional development,” is defined in section 9101 (34).)
- 3.3 Performance indicator: The percentage of paraprofessionals (excluding those with sole duties as translators and parental involvement assistants) who are qualified. (See criteria in section 1119(c) and (d).)

**Performance goal 4:** All students will be educated in learning environments that are safe, drug free, and conducive to learning.

- 4.1 Performance indicator: The number of persistently dangerous schools, as defined by the State.

**Performance Goal 5:** All students will graduate from high school.

- 5.1 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who graduate from high school each year with a regular diploma,  
--disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;  
--calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

- 5.2 Performance indicator: The percentage of students who drop out of school,  
--disaggregated by race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, migrant status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged;  
--calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

(Note: ESEA section 1907 requires States to report all LEA data regarding annual school dropout rates in the State disaggregated by race and ethnicity according to procedures that conform with the National Center for Educational Statistics’ (NCES) Common Core of Data. Consistent with this requirement, States must use NCES’ definition of “high school dropout,” i.e., a student in grades 9-12 who (a) was enrolled in the district at sometime during the previous school year; (b) was not enrolled at the beginning of the succeeding school year; (c) has not graduated or completed a program of studies by the maximum age established by the State; (d) has not transferred to another public school district or to a non-public school or to a State-approved educational program; and (e) has not left school because of death, illness, or school-approved absence.

(Note: As it develops regulations or guidance for the Title I, Part A program, the Department will determine what, if any, modifications to Indicators 5.1 and 5.2 are needed to ensure conformance with Title I requirements.)



### **State Performance Targets and Data Collection**

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE), in collaboration with the Arizona Governor's Office and the Arizona State Board of Education, will establish state performance targets which represent the progress Arizona expects to make with respect to each ESEA indicator and any additional goals and indicators Arizona may add to the five ESEA goals and corresponding indicators. The ADE also agrees to report on all indicators.

These will be included in the next submission.

## PART II: STATE ACTIVITIES TO IMPLEMENT ESEA ACTIVITIES

### 1. Describe the State's system of standards, assessments and accountability and provide evidence that it meets the requirements of the ESEA.

#### *1.a Adoption of challenging academic content standards in Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science at each grade level (grades 3-8).*

The Arizona Academic Standards are a powerful teaching, learning and accountability tool. These standards are the foundation for *all* Arizona students, including those with disabilities and limited-English proficiency, to receive a quality, rigorous and meaningful education that fully prepares them for a successful future.

The Arizona Academic Standards drive the elements of curriculum and instruction in all public elementary and secondary schools, including charter schools, served by the State. In its efforts to develop a complete system of standards-based education, Arizona has adopted content standards for the following academic areas<sup>1</sup>:

- **Language Arts** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 7/8/96.)
- **Mathematics** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 8/26/96.)
- **Science** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 6/23/97.)
- **Social Studies** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 3/27/00.)
- **The Arts** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 4/28/97.)
- **Technology** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 9/25/00.)
- **Workplace Skills** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 3/24/97.)
- **Comprehensive Health and P.E.** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 4/28/97.)
- **Foreign and Native Languages** (Adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education on 4/28/97.)

By implementing academic content standards that include concepts and performance objectives that specify what students should know and be able to do, contain coherent and rigorous material and encourage the instruction of advanced skills, Arizona continues to comply with NCLB Title I requirements [Section 1111(b)(1)(D)(i)(I-III)]. Currently, the State's academic content standards are articulated at various grade spans, which include five levels: *Readiness* (Kindergarten); *Foundations* (grades 1-3); *Essentials* (grades 4-8); *Proficiency* (grades 9-12) and *Distinction* (Honors course work). The Arizona Department of Education (ADE), in consultation with representatives from various local education agencies (LEAs) and schools served by the State, will complete a grade level content standards articulation for grades Kindergarten through 10 in Reading and Mathematics during the summer of 2002 (please refer to Appendix, Attachment 1a).

---

<sup>1</sup> Arizona Academic Content Standards can be found at [www.ade.az.gov/standards](http://www.ade.az.gov/standards).

The ADE plans to complete a similar grade level standards articulation for grades Kindergarten through 10 in Science no later than the summer of 2003 (See Appendix, Attachment 1b). It should be noted that these grade level articulations of adopted Reading/Mathematics and Science content standards will not affect the core content of the standards themselves.

***1. b Adoption of Challenging academic content standards in science that meet the requirements of section 1111(b)(1)***

See Appendix, Attachment 1a – 1d.

***1. c Development and implementation of State assessments in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics tested annually in grades 3-8 and Science tested once during grades 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12.***

Arizona's assessment program currently consists of Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) and the Stanford Achievement Test, Ninth Edition, which are both administered annually during the spring semester. AIMS is a direct measure of the achievement of all students against State academic standards in the content areas of Reading, Writing and Mathematics in grades 3,5,8 and high schools as required by NCLB Title I assessment requirements [Section 1111 (b)(3)(C)(v)(I)]. The Stanford is a national, norm-referenced test that is administered to students in grades 2 through 9.

In developing the Arizona assessment program, the ADE has adopted the following core beliefs:

- The elements of curriculum, instruction and assessment must be inclusive and equitable for **all** students in every district and school.
- The Arizona Academic Standards provide the foundation for curriculum, instruction and assessment in our State.
- Increasing the academic achievement of **every** student must become a common goal for all schools.
- **All** students must have the opportunity to demonstrate what they know and are able to do.
- **Each** student can benefit from instructional changes and educational reforms that are implemented in response to information based on assessment results.

These core beliefs continue to guide the direction of Arizona's assessment policies and procedures. For this reason, the State's assessment program includes the following provisions:

- The participation of all public school students, including students with disabilities.
- Appropriate adaptations for students with disabilities (if required by an Individualized Education Program (IEP) or 504/Individual Achievement Plan (IAP)).
- Alternate assessments (AIMS-A) for students with low functioning cognitive abilities if required by an IEP (an estimated 1%-2% of the State's student population).

- Inclusion of limited English proficient (LEP) students in the State's assessment program with appropriate accommodations (AIMS only, lasting no longer than three consecutive years).<sup>2</sup>
- Assessments (particularly AIMS) that are aligned with the State's content and performance/achievement standards and provide coherent information about student attainment of these standards.
- Assessments that involve multiple up-to-date measures of student academic achievement, including measures that assess higher-order thinking skills and understanding.
- The reporting of itemized score analyses (at the concept level) to districts and schools.
- The production and dissemination of individual student interpretive, descriptive and diagnostic reports in a timely manner.
- Results disaggregated by gender, major racial/ethnic groups, English proficiency status and students with disabilities compared to non-disabled<sup>3</sup>.

Presently, the ADE is reviewing all relevant State assessment policies and procedures to analyze our compatibility with No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Title I assessment requirements. Priorities include the resolution of incongruent State and federal testing policies involving out-of-level testing and the development of assessments at *each* grade level (3-8) to measure the achievement of all students against Arizona's Academic Standards in Reading/Language Arts and Mathematics as stipulated by NCLB Title I assessment requirements (**See Appendix, Attachment 1c**). These assessments will be developed in consultation with LEAs and schools. Due to its design as a criterion-referenced assessment, AIMS best meets these requirements at this time. In addition, the ADE is working with LEAs and schools to begin the development assessments to measure the achievement of all students against Arizona's Academic Standards in Science that will be administered at least once during the following grade spans: 3-5, 6-9 and 10-12 (**See Appendix, Attachment 1c**).

---

<sup>2</sup> Arizona Revised Statutes (ARS) §15-755 clearly stipulates that, "a standardized, nationally-normed written test of academic subject material given in English shall be administered at least once each year to all Arizona public school children...." This statute results from the voter approval of Proposition 203 in November 2000. The ADE utilizes the Stanford 9, administered in grades 2 through 9, to fulfill this requirement. The complete text of ARS §15-755 can be found at [www.azleg.state.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.us/ars).

<sup>3</sup> The ADE does not produce results disaggregated by economically disadvantaged students compared to non-disadvantaged students or migratory status. Currently, ADE is developing methods to secure this data before the 2002-2003 testing cycle in order to meet the NCLB Title I disaggregated data requirement.

### ***1. d Setting academic achievement standards in Reading/Language Arts, Mathematics and Science***

Arizona's performance/achievement standards<sup>4</sup> describe the knowledge and skills that students must achieve in order to place in various performance levels. Furthermore, the achievement standards provide valuable information about each student's progress in meeting the Arizona Academic Standards. This information must serve as the basis for further instruction and intervention.

On March 2, 1999, the Arizona State Board of Education adopted four performance levels to guide the scoring and assessment of student performance on AIMS for Reading, Writing and Mathematics:

- ***Exceeds the Standard:*** This level denotes demonstration of a wealth of knowledge, skills and abilities expressed in the Arizona Academic Standards.
- ***Meets the Standard:*** This level denotes demonstration of a solid understanding of the concepts and procedures/strategies expressed in the Arizona Academic Standards.  
**Attainment of at least this level is the objective for all students.**
- ***Approaches the Standard:*** This level denotes demonstration of some understanding of the concepts and procedures/strategies as expressed in the Arizona Academic Standards. Students who approach the standard demonstrate competency in the prerequisites necessary to begin working on the challenging content required of the student who meets the standards, but do not demonstrate full understanding of that content.
- ***Falls Far Below the Standard:*** This level denotes insufficient evidence of the prerequisite skills needed to approach meeting the standards. Students who perform at this level have serious gaps in knowledge and skills relating to the Arizona Academic Standards as measured by AIMS. These students typically require a considerable amount of additional work and remediation in the basic skills that are prerequisite to the challenging academic standards at the current grade level.

These performance categories/levels are known as the FAME scale and are consistent with ESEA Title I achievement standard requirements because they describe two levels

---

<sup>4</sup> A complete version of Arizona's Performance/Achievement Standards can be found at [www.ade.az.gov/standards/AIMS/PerformanceStandards](http://www.ade.az.gov/standards/AIMS/PerformanceStandards). Cut scores were submitted to the U.S. Department of Education in April 2002 to fulfill timeline waiver requirements.

of high achievement (advanced=Exceeds the Standard *and* proficient=Meets the Standards), while also describing a third level of low achievement (basic/=Approaches the Standards) [Section 1111 (b)(1)(D)(II-III)]. These achievement standards apply to all students who are administered AIMS (currently in grades 3, 5, 8 and high school).

Following the adoption of the performance categories/levels by the State Board of Education, a committee of experienced educators, representing various LEAs and schools across the State, met to develop the performance/achievement standards. Using the Bookmark Analysis Method, these educators examined AIMS and came to a consensus about the specific knowledge and skills students should demonstrate at the different FAME performance categories/levels. Arizona's performance/achievement standards provide a detailed description (known as Performance Level Descriptors) of what students know and can do in reference to academic content measured by AIMS.

Each of the FAME performance categories/levels has a content-specific, detailed description of the knowledge, skills and abilities held by students in a particular performance level. Unlike traditional scores where student achievement is presented in terms of numeric scores, performance descriptors provide concrete and meaningful information concerning student performance on AIMS. Performance Level Descriptors represent powerful information that can be utilized to guide curriculum and instruction in the classroom. Students, parents, administrators and teachers can determine not only what knowledge and skills the student currently knows and can demonstrate, but also the knowledge and skills needed to advance to higher performance levels.

***Note: 1.e-1.g refer to the January 31, 2003 submission and are not included***

***1. h Implementation of a single accountability system that uses the same criteria, based primarily on assessments consistent with Section 1111 (b), for determining whether a school has made adequate yearly progress (AYP), regardless of whether the school receives Title I, Part A, or other federal funds.***

With the recent passage of Chapter Law 284 (AZ LEARNS) amending ARS §15-241<sup>5</sup>, the ADE will implement a comprehensive system of purposeful school accountability. AZ LEARNS serves as Arizona's proposed plan to implement accountability requirements mandated by the No Child Left Behind Act (NCLB)<sup>6</sup>. Inherent within the new accountability system established under AZ LEARNS is our intention to accurately measure the academic achievement level (including the ability to make AYP) of all public schools, including charter schools, served by the State.

---

<sup>5</sup> Complete text of ARS §15-241 can be found at [www.azleg.state.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.us/ars).

<sup>6</sup> The ADE is examining consistencies and inconsistencies between AZ LEARNS and NCLB in an attempt to establish congruency between the two. This includes, but is not limited to, rewards, sanctions and the timing issue resulting from the achievement profile release date of October 15 (as stipulated by ARS §15-241) and the Title I requirement to identify all schools for improvement by the beginning of the school year. The ADE is currently investigating possible resolutions (either through State statute or contractual provisions with the State's testing company) in order to meet related NCLB Title I requirements by 2003.

To produce a valid determination of each school's academic achievement level, the ADE asserts that it is necessary to utilize baseline data, from as early as 1999-2000, to accomplish this objective. By doing so, we will not carry over potentially invalid school classifications which were established under the Arizona Title I Transitional Assessment Plan. While acknowledging our intention to halt the completion of the State's Transitional Assessment Plan, it is important to note that by implementing AZ LEARNS in its place, no schools will be identified as being in years three or four of the accountability system established under Arizona's transitional plan.

AZ LEARNS, however, accelerates the identification of schools in need of improvement and subsequent actions/consequences as mandated by NCLB. In effect, year one of AZ LEARNS is tantamount to year two of NCLB. Under AZ LEARNS, each school not making AYP will be identified for improvement in the first year, which automatically triggers corrective actions such as the development of a school improvement plan (SIP) and mandatory parental and residential notification. Furthermore, Arizona's open enrollment<sup>7</sup> law (ARS §15-816) mandates that LEAs allow pupils to enroll in any school within the district or in any school located within other school districts in the State. Parents may choose to enroll their child at any time (including post identification) in another public school, provided there is space available in the desired school. These elements, coupled together, advance the objective of continual school improvement in NCLB.

The cornerstone of the new accountability system established by AZ LEARNS is the achievement profile. The strength of the achievement profile is its ability to accurately measure an individual school's performance. The achievement profile for schools that offer instruction in Kindergarten programs and grades one through eight, or any combination of those programs or grades, will consist of two academic indicators as mandated by NCLB Title I accountability requirements [Section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(vi)].

The first and primary elementary achievement profile indicator is student performance on AIMS. AIMS student performance data will be analyzed using a three-year rolling average in order to effectively measure achievement trends rather than anomalies. This method of analysis significantly improves the accuracy of school identifications/classifications. Using AIMS results, the ADE will compute the percentage of pupils who *meet* (are proficient) or *exceed* (are advanced) the State's academic content standards, which is consistent with ESEA Title I requirements [Section 1111 (b)(2)(c)(iv)]. The second elementary achievement profile academic indicator is currently in development.

Like the elementary level achievement profile, the first and primary academic indicator utilized for the secondary level achievement profile is student performance on AIMS (using a two-year rolling average). The secondary level achievement profile will also incorporate graduation rate as stipulated by ESEA Title I requirements [Section 1111 (b)(2)(C)(vi)] with the possible inclusion of another indicator such as dropout rate. All additional indicators utilized on both elementary and secondary level achievement

---

<sup>7</sup> Complete text of ARS §15-816 can be found at [www.azleg.state.az.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars).



profiles will be finalized during the fall<sup>8</sup> of 2002. The ADE will develop Arizona's definition of AYP in the areas of Reading/ Language Arts and Mathematics.

***1.i Identification of the languages present in the student population to be assessed<sup>9</sup>, the languages in which the State administers assessments and the languages in which the State will need to administer assessments.***

Currently, the ADE assessment policies require that both the Stanford 9 and AIMS be administered in English only. ARS §15-775<sup>10</sup> stipulates that "In order to ensure that the educational progress of all Arizona students in academic subjects and in learning English is properly monitored, a standardized, nationally-normed written test of academic subject matter given in English shall be administered at least once each year to all Arizona public school children...." The ADE utilizes the Stanford 9 to fulfill this legal requirement in grades 2 through 9. In addition, ARS §15-752<sup>11</sup> mandates that, "...all children in Arizona public schools shall be taught English by being taught in English and all children shall be placed in English language classrooms." In order to implement assessments that reflect curriculum and instruction, the ADE requires an English version of AIMS to assess all students.

***1.j Evidence that, beginning not later than the school year 2002-2003, LEAs will provide for an annual assessment of English proficiency that meets the requirements of sections 1111(b)(7) and 3116(d)(4), including assessment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension. Identify the assessment(s) the state will designate for this purpose.***

The process of annually testing Arizona English Language Learners started two years ago. As a result of a considerable examination regarding the issues of assessment for Limited English Proficient (LEP) students in Arizona's public schools, four English proficiency tests were adopted in the fall of 2000 by an appointed task force. The adopted test recommendations were implemented throughout the state to more adequately serve LEP students. LEAs may select from these tests to evaluate LEP students annually for English proficiency. The four English proficiency tests adopted: Idea Proficiency Test (IPT); Language Assessment Scales (LAS); Woodcock Munoz Language Survey (WMLS); and Woodcock Language Proficiency Battery Revised (WLPB-R, are used in our state for initial identification of English Language Learners (ELLs) for re-assessment and re-classification of English proficiency, and for a two-year follow-up after a student has been reclassified as Fluent English Proficient (FEP). New Arizona statute A.R.S. §15-755 and House Bill 2010 mandated that all students, including ELLs, be tested with a

---

<sup>8</sup> As per ARS §15-241 (AZ LEARNS) the Arizona State Board of Education must determine criteria to develop achievement profiles and the system to classify schools.

<sup>9</sup> Please refer to Appendix, Attachment titled ***Languages Present in Arizona's Student Population (2001-2002)*** [Arizona Language Census and program (ALCAP) Report; Academic Support Division, Arizona Department of Education

<sup>10</sup> Complete text of ARS §15-755 can be found at [www.azleg.state.az.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars).

<sup>11</sup> Complete text of ARS §15-752 can be found at [www.azleg.state.az.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars).



standardized and/or state testing examination in academic core subjects and, at the same time, that all ELLs be tested annually for English proficiency.

***1.k Describe the status of the state's effort to establish standards and annual measurable achievement objectives under section 3122(a) of the ESEA that relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency by limited English proficient children. These standards and objectives must relate to the development and attainment of English proficiency in speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension, and be aligned with the state academic content and student academic achievement standards as required by section 1111(b)(1) of the ESEA. If they are not yet established, describe the state's plan and timeline for completing the development of these standards and achievement objectives.***

An appointed Task Force selected four English proficiency tests to measure English language proficiency in the domains of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension of the English language. Students who scored below the publisher's designated scores for fluent English proficiency are classified as English language learners and placed in an English language program designed to help students meet English proficiency and the Arizona academic standards.

The basic standards for Arizona's language acquisition programs are identified in several different sources, which include Proposition 203, Flores Consent Decree, recently enacted HB 2010, and the federal No Child Left Behind Act of 2001. These basic standards, *English language assessment, Native language assessment, English language learner programs, Qualification of personnel, English language learners instructional materials, and English language learners compensatory education*, will help establish annual measurable objectives to help ELLs develop and attain English language proficiency.

In our English language programs, all ELLs are provided with daily instruction in English language development appropriate to their levels of English proficiency. The English language instruction includes listening and speaking skills, reading and writing skills, and cognitive and academic development in English. All ELLs are provided instruction in basic subject areas under the course of study adopted by the Arizona State Board of Education that is understandable and appropriate to the level of academic achievement of the ELL and is in conformity with the accepted strategies for teaching ELLs. All the curriculum used in ELL programs incorporates the Arizona Academic Standards, adopted by the Arizona State Board, comparable in amount, scope and quality to that provided to English proficient students.

Rules proposed by the Arizona State Board of Education to implement these standards are still under review. The proposed rules should be certified by fall, 2002.

## **2. Describe the process for awarding competitive subgrants for the programs listed below.**

The ADE follows state procurement policy and adheres to federal and state statutes, regulations and assurances when soliciting competitive projects. Competitive grants are awarded in accordance with Arizona statutes, which requires a Request for Grant Proposal be written specifying all required expectations for the entities to perform through a description or scope of work.

### ***2.1) Even Start Family Literacy (Title I, Part B)***

#### **Timelines**

During spring, 2001, the ADE conducted a competitive award process for multiple-year subgrants. The process included the following steps:

- |                        |  |
|------------------------|--|
| •December, 2000        | Consultation with Committee of Practitioners   |
| •February, 2001        | Release and advertisement of RFG   |
| •February 28, 2001     | Pre-application workshop   |
| •March 6- 8, 2001      | Regional. Family Literacy Awareness Workshops  |
| •April 18, 2001        | Application submission deadline  |
| •April 30-May 11, 2001 | Applications reviewed by Technical Review Panel consisting of: Maureen Hoyt, Adult Educator; Janice Smith, Early Childhood Educator; Meta Potts, nationally recognized. Family Literacy expert |
| •June 20, 2001         | Contract negotiations with continuation programs completed   |
| •June 30, 2001         | Contract negotiations with new programs completed  |
| •July 1, 2001          | New, multiple-year contracts began   |

Currently funded programs will continue to receive funding through 2004 upon satisfactorily maintaining or exceeding program expectations and outcomes.

It is anticipated that a new RFG process will be initiated in February, 2005 with new grants allocated July 2005.

Successful applications included assurances that the local program employed personnel (administrators, teachers and staff) who held appropriate degrees, credentials and certifications that showed evidence of training in age appropriate education.

Successful applications also included descriptions of the plan of operation and the planning process, including goals, objectives, strategies and program evaluation and continuous improvement practices.

The ADE required all new program staff to attend Implementation Training before beginning program/new program operations.

### **Selection criteria**

The ADE considers the applicant's score scale ranking and past performance in addition to the availability of funding and the geographic distribution of monies within Arizona when granting awards.

Specific criteria includes:

- Integration of the four Even Start components and an additional Arizona component, community service, into a comprehensive family literacy program
- Services of sufficient intensity in hours and of sufficient duration to make sustainable changes in the family.
- Services that provide for multiple years of early childhood education, ranging from birth through 8 years of age
- Targeted families with high poverty, illiteracy, unemployment, limited English proficiency or such factors as domestic violence, teen pregnancy, or parents receiving TANF assistance.
- Distribution of targeted population within counties/state
- Illiteracy/unemployment rates within counties
- Applicant goals that address:
  - Interactive literacy activities between parent and their children
  - Training of parents as their child's primary teacher and full partner in the education process
  - Parent literacy training that leads to economic self-sufficiency
  - Age-appropriate and developmental education to prepare their children for success in school and in life experiences
  - Fulfilling Arizona's additional component of Community Service
- Narrative descriptions that address eight (8) program criteria:
  - Applicant's qualifications to provide Family Literacy Services to adults and their children from birth through seven years of age
  - Effectiveness of applicant's program planning process
  - Curriculum and instruction (hours, use of State Standards and current emergent reading and brain research, student-centered learning strategies, open access, accommodations)
  - Understanding of performance targets and educational gains of adults and children (screening and preparation, goal setting, assessment, transitional plans)
  - Support services provided directly or indirectly (linkages, ways to overcome barriers to academic achievements)
  - Plan for recruitment and retention of eligible participants
  - Staff development and professional development provisions for all staff (how the new guidelines for credentialing and certifying staff are addressed)

- Use of grant funding to implement/improve the Family Literacy program and leverage other resources
  - A budget plan that reflected increasing matching funds.
- Narrative descriptions for Model Programs included:
  - Applicant's experience and recognition as a Family Literacy service deliverer
  - Applicant's experience providing technical assistance to other family literacy programs.

## **Priorities**

- **First Priority:** Existing Family Literacy programs that have demonstrated effectiveness in meeting program indicators and student educational gains/outcomes
- **Second Priority:** New Applicants from geographic areas currently unserved or Project Applicants partnering with Title I A Schools in empowerment zones or enterprise communities
- **Third Priority:** New Applicants from geographic areas currently served

## ***2. 2) Education of Migrant Children (Title I, Part C)***

Selection criteria are based on eligibility, cost, capacity of the entity to perform the work, evaluation of program, and prior knowledge and experience with the Migrant Education program.

The purpose of the competitive grants is to support Migrant Education activities that raise academic achievement on a statewide level as well as at the local level.

- Statewide Services establish Certificates of Eligibility for each eligible migrant student as well as immediately provide to receiving schools student records that indicate academic and health information as the migratory students move from school district to school district and from state to state. Special training for migrant staff and teachers of migrant students that addresses the unique academic and social needs of migrant students is also provided through statewide services.
- Technology grants are awarded on a competitive basis to schools and LEAs that submit a plan for using technology to promote academic support and improved achievement for migrant students.
- Several small, specialized grants are also awarded to eligible entities that serve migrant students.

At the end of each grant period, an evaluation report is submitted by the awarded entity to ensure funds are used in an effective manner.

### ***2. 3) Prevention and Intervention for Children Who Are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk—Local Agency Programs (Title I, Part D, Subpart 2)***

The State subgrant process is a non-competitive formula-based subgrant. Allocations are determined by using the data collected in the annual survey completed by LEAs serving Neglected and Delinquent populations. Subgrants may be applied for and dispersed on the following timeline:

- October 15<sup>th</sup>-Surveys are sent to LEAs and are returned to ADE by December 15<sup>th</sup>
- January 15<sup>th</sup> -ADE mails aggregated data to USDOE
- Spring -SEA receives allocation
- April 15<sup>th</sup>-Notifications and application instructions are sent to LEAs
- May 15<sup>th</sup> - Applications are due to ADE
- May 30<sup>th</sup> -Qualifying applications are approved and notifications are processed
- July 1- funds are eligible for disbursement
- Completion Report is due to the ADE within 90 days of the **end** of the project

Each LEA desiring assistance will submit an application which describes

- the program to be assisted;
- any formal agreements, regarding the program to be assisted, between:the LEA and correctional facilities and alternative school programs serving children and youth involved with the juvenile justice system;
- the program operated by participating schools for children and youth returning from correctional facilities;
- the characteristics of children and youth returning from correctional facilities;
- how the program will be coordinated with other federal, state, and local programs under *The Juvenile Justice and Delinquent Prevention Act of 1974*; and
- the efforts of participating schools to ensure correctional facilities working with children and youth are aware of a child's or youth's existing IEP.

Each LEA desiring assistance submits an application which, as appropriate, also describes

- how participating schools will coordinate with facilities to ensure such children and youth are participating in educational programs comparable to those operated at the local school such youth would attend;
- how schools will coordinate with existing social, health and other services to meet the needs of students returning from correctional facilities;
- any partnerships with local businesses to develop training, curriculum-based youth entrepreneurship education and mentoring services;
- how the program will involve parents to improve educational achievement, assist in drop out prevention and prevention of involvement in delinquent activities;
- how schools will work with probation officers to meet the needs of children and youth returning from correctional facilities; and

- the steps participating schools will take to find alternative placements for children and youth interested in continuing their education, but unable to participate in a regular public school program.

### **Selection Criteria**

The State subgrant process is a non-competitive formula-based subgrant. Allocations are determined by using the data collected in the annual survey completed by LEAs serving N and D populations.

### **Priorities**

The State subgrant process is a non-competitive formula-based subgrant. Allocations are determined by using the data collected in the annual survey completed by LEAs serving N and D populations.

### ***2. 4) Comprehensive School Reform (Title I, Part F)***

The ADE seeks to continue the process currently being used to assist Title I schools identified for school improvement. New timelines will be established based on the new state accountability system that will begin in the fall of 2002. A preliminary group of Title I schools has already been taken through this process (Cycle I schools). A second group of Title I schools is currently going through the same process (Cycle II). Another cycle is anticipated for the coming school year and this process will continue as long as feasible.

The current process being implemented creates a rank ordering of the list of schools identified for school improvement. The schools farthest away from meeting Adequate Yearly Progress were eligible for two funding streams: Title I School Improvement funds and Comprehensive School Reform funds. This process emphasizes strong accountability by requiring these schools to meet certain eligibility requirements that include attending workshops designed to assist them in their school reform efforts and hiring an External Facilitator trained to assist them in completing a School Improvement Plan/CSRD application.

Title I Accountability Funds were used for the planning process, CSRD funds for the implementation phase.

The current RFP can be obtained from the following website:  
[www.ade.az.gov/asd/Title1/AccountabilityGrants](http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/Title1/AccountabilityGrants)

**2. 5) Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund—subgrants to eligible partnerships (Title II, Part A, Subpart 3)**

The Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR) had set the date of May 30, 2002, for completion of its School Year 2002/03 Request for Proposals under Title II, Part A, Subpart 3, Subgrants to Eligible Partnerships. This document, however, has not been finalized in time to attach it for this submission.

The State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) shall make funds available on a competitive basis to institutions of higher education in the state which apply and which demonstrate the involvement of local educational agencies (LEAs). The SAHE shall make ensure equitable participation of private and public institutions of higher education. Amounts available shall be used for:

- a. establishing preservice programs to prepare new teachers who teach in critical content areas of mathematics and science, and other core subjects;
- b. retraining of secondary school teachers who specialize in disciplines other than the teaching of mathematics or science;
- c. inservice training for elementary, secondary, and vocational school teachers; and
- d. training for other appropriate school personnel to improve their teaching skills.

Each institution of higher education receiving a grant under this subsection *shall assure that programs of training, retraining, and in-service training will take into account the need for greater access to and participation in mathematics and science careers by students from historically underrepresented and/or underserved groups, including females, minorities, individuals with limited English proficiency, the handicapped, and the gifted and talented, and will ensure cooperative agreements or arrangements with local educational agencies.*

No institution of higher education may receive assistance to provide inservice training and retraining of the elementary and secondary school teachers in the public and private schools of the school district of each such agency unless the institution enters into an agreement with a local educational agency (LEA), or consortium of such agencies. (Note: Each proposal must be developed jointly with a school, school district or districts and the project must be part of the professional development plan of the school or school district(s).

**PROGRAM GUIDELINES**

Teachers are the focal point of education. They serve as models, motivators, and mentors; they are the instigators of the learning process. Education in mathematics, science, and technology can be strengthened only if teachers are well prepared and highly motivated.

Effective projects for strengthening a teacher have the following characteristics, according to National Science Foundation findings. Project proposals should:

- combine the best in subject matter content and instructional strategies;
- involve collaboration of teachers, administrators, mathematicians, scientists, and
- mathematics and science educators, where appropriate, at every stage of project
- design and implementation;

- address components necessary to effect changes at the school level;
- address the needs of groups who are historically underrepresented and/or underserved in mathematics and science;
- describe and implement effective follow-up activities which provide for collaboration on a continuing basis, after the project has been completed; and
- infuse technology into the teaching, learning, and doing of mathematics and science.

Proposals must incorporate most, if not all, of these characteristics. The proposal must demonstrate that its development was a collaborative effort of university and school personnel and that the project is supported by the school administration, including substantial financial support. Further, the proposal should be part of a professional development plan to create systemic reform and involve more than teacher volunteers. Projects which address inclusive groups, such as all teachers in an elementary school, all middle science school teachers in a school or district, all K-3 teachers in a school or district, all secondary math teachers, etc., will have highest priority for funding.

Proposals should describe procedures to gather data to evaluate the effectiveness of the project in achieving the project's stated outcomes. Both qualitative and quantitative data should be collected and analyzed. Proposals for continuing projects must also include a plan to document the long-term benefits of the second/third project. Specific information requirements will be provided to Principal Investigators after a project is funded. The Principal Investigator is expected to be a regular faculty member or have a close association with the submitting institution. The person named as the Principal Investigator on the proposal is expected to fulfill this role. Any redesignation of the Principal Investigator or substitution(s) for the Principal Investigator, or other persons who have substantive role(s) in the project must be pre-approved and may necessitate a reevaluation of the project. Personnel listed are deemed to be an integral part of the submitted project and as such are part of the project evaluation.

### **Innovative Programs**

The Innovative Programs Goal encourages principal investigators to take different, untried approaches to improve mathematics and science education. The general guidelines for the purpose of the Eisenhower proposals must be met in these proposals. We now have new and powerful technologies available. Due to these advances, industry is going through a revolution equivalent to the Industrial Revolution of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. What are some of the approaches we should be trying in education to keep pace with society and the technological revolution?

*Goal:* Assist in the generation of *new* and *innovative* approaches to the enhancement of mathematics and science education.

### **Traineeship Programs / Preservice Programs**

The preservice preparation of teachers is fundamental in the attainment of a population of well-qualified mathematics and science teachers for the State of Arizona for grades kindergarten through twelve.

*Goals:* a. Assist in generating exemplary teacher preparation programs that may be replicated throughout Arizona.



- b. Assist in developing innovative and effective recruiting strategies of historically underrepresented and/or underserved groups into the fields of mathematics and science.
- c. Assist in the support of the professional development of faculty who are interested in strengthening their pedagogical knowledge and teaching skills, who teach courses to prospective teachers, modeling excellent teaching strategies.

### **Teacher Enhancement Programs/Inservice Programs**

The Teacher Enhancement Program endeavors to increase and broaden the mathematical and scientific knowledge of the inservice teacher, as well as improve his/her pedagogical and technological skills.

*Goals:*

- Assist in providing new and additional education in content and instructional strategies.
- Assist in bridging the gap between educational research in science and mathematics education and the application of research findings to the improvement of classroom instruction.
- Assist institutions of higher education to conduct instructional activities and strategies that the teachers will apply to the education of their students.
- Assist the K-12 teachers in making systemic reform in science and mathematics learning in their classrooms.

### **Proposal Requirements**

- Cover Sheet
- Table of Contents
- Project Summary
- Project Description
- Needs
  - Intended Outcomes
  - Related Literature
  - Procedures
  - Collaboration
  - Evaluation
  - Dissemination
- References
- Curriculum Vitae
- Budget and Budget Explanation

### **Timeline:**

The award begins operationally when the institution is notified of the award. The proposed duration for which support is requested should be consistent with the general guidelines of twelve calendar months. Any requests for variations must be preapproved by the ABOR Senior Program Coordinator. A continuing project must compete for funding on its own merits, along with all other grant applications submitted for a particular funding cycle. A continuing project would be approved individually on the

basis of documented evidence of having met the stated goals of the previous year of funding. Consequently, a progress report of accomplishments to date must accompany the proposal for second and third year funding. If a continuing project was funded for continuation, the project must include plans for termination to be funded for this final year.

## **2. 6) Enhanced Education Through Technology (Title II, Part D)**

All application documents created for the competitive portion of the Enhancing Education Through Technology Grant align to the Ed Tech Guidance document provided by the United States Department of Education (USDE).

### **Timeline**

#### **February**

2/23 to 2/28 Attended briefing and training for State Tech Directors in Crystal City

#### **March 2002**

3/1 to 3/20 - Developed application documents aligned to Ed Tech requirements

On-going - identified/recruited peer reviewers - selected 33 in teams of 3-members = 11 teams

3/20 - Issued Fund Alert and open RFAs, post all documents to Internet as downloads

3/20 - Provided intensive technical assistance workshops in state to LEAs on program & process

#### **April 2002**

On-going - TA workshops & one-on-one assistance to LEAs by RTCs & State Staff

Selected dates, locations for training reviewers and to conduct review phases

4/30 Close RFA - 104 applications submitted, 4 disqualified

#### **May 2002**

5/1 Processed applications and assign to review teams

5/2 Trained reviewers

5/2 to 5/14 Review Teams review on their own assigned projects

5/15, 5/16, 5/17 - Completed Review Process

5/20 to 5/24 Aggregated review data and select sub-grantees

5/30 Submitted list of sub-grantees to Arizona State Board for approval

#### **June 2002**

6/24 State Board Review list of sub-grantees and formally approve funding

6/25 to 6/28 Notify sub-grantees to submit on-line in Grants Management System

6/25 Notify non-awarded LEAs of review results & copies

#### **July 2002 –June 2003**

Approve On-Line Projects; disseminate funds

Provide TA and support to projects on-going

Monitor for compliance periodically though year

Assist all LEAs identified as needing improvement or in corrective action in developing training programs and identifying resources to assist them on-going year-round.

The purposes of the Ed Tech Grant Program are:

- To improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools.
- To assist every student – regardless of race, ethnicity, income, geographical location, or disability – in becoming technologically literate by the end of eighth grade.
- To encourage the effective integration of technology resources and systems with professional development and curriculum development to promote research-based instructional methods that can be widely replicated.

The RFA was opened on March 20 for a six-week period. The Ed Tech Competitive Application, Technology Plan Template, Scoring Rubric and Review Criteria, the Letter of Intent for the Formula Grants, the Fund Alert, the State Technology Plan, and the Ed Tech Guidance document were developed to align with the Ed Tech legislative requirements and made available as downloads to all LEAs at the following website: <http://www.ade.az.gov/technology>. In addition, the program office and the Regional Training Center personnel provided training workshops to LEAs at key locations throughout the state during the application period.

### **Selection Criteria and Priorities**

For the Competitive Comprehensive Implementation Grant, only an eligible local entity that is either a “high-need local educational agency” or an “eligible local partnership” may apply. All LEAs were urged to look at partnerships that would assist them in meeting the Ed Tech program requirements in addressing their local needs for improvement, technology integration, and professional development.

- A “high-need local educational agency” is an LEA that is among those LEAs in the state with sixty percent (60%) of their children from families with incomes below the poverty line; **AND**
- Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the ESEA; **OR**
- Has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.

Title I data was used to determine which LEAs met the poverty eligibility criteria and which schools have been identified as needing corrective action or are low-performing schools. Assessment reviews provided by the Regional Training Centers will provide the program office with information on the high technology needs.

Submission of an updated comprehensive technology plan, which aligns with the State and National Technology Plans was a proposal requirement. Another program requirement was that twenty-five percent (25%) of the requested funds were to be used for professional development of school staff.

Arizona developed a scoring rubric for competitive proposals which placed very rigorous requirements on applicants to address professional development for classroom teachers for the improvement of academic achievement. Emphasis was also placed on the evaluation and accountability measures that would ultimately reveal LEA progress toward improved student achievement. All Comprehensive Implementation Grant applications were evaluated and scored based on the rubric by teams of peer reviewers. There are three phases of the review process. The proposals that made it to the final phase are among those selected for funding. For the Ed Tech competition, careful consideration was given to ensure that urban and rural districts received an equal share of the competitive funds. In determining the awards, consideration will be given in providing sufficient funds to enable the LEA to achieve their goals and objectives and have successful projects. The Regional Training Center and program staff will provide on-going assistance and support to LEAs in improving their schools and providing quality professional development opportunities and training to schools needing improvement and corrective action.

Special consideration in the form of 20 extra points was given to projects that:

- Addressed AZ READS Initiative and AZ LEARNS Initiative;
- Would receive less than \$5,000 of Title I formula funding through the Ed Tech Formula Grant; and
- Included schools identified by ADE as needing improvement or corrective action.

### **Formula Grants,**

The technology program office is awaiting the current Title I funding formula to determine final disbursement and release of the Ed Tech funding. In the meantime, LEAs that receive Title I funds were notified in a fund alert to submit their *Letter of Intent*, and an updated Technology Plan to ADE. LEAs that applied for the competitive grants used their proposals in applying for the formula grants.

In Arizona, many LEAs are very small due to the large number of charter schools. We left the formula grant open to everyone that receives Title I funds regardless of how small the award might be. To some LEAs, a \$1,000 can mean professional development training they would not be able to fund from another source. The formal on-line grant application will be made available to those LEAs that submitted a Letter of Intent. LEAs were also given the opportunity to consolidate their formula funding with other allowable programs in their consolidated plans.

The state contends that it has set rigorous standards for LEA Ed Tech competitive applications, and has included several key elements that ensure that funded projects will be successful to improve student achievement. The state also selected and trained high quality personnel to serve as proposal reviewers. Strong State initiatives, a good State Technology Plan, and LEA support processes through the Regional Training Centers and the program staff are also in place to assist LEAs toward this goal. Technical support and assistance will be on-going throughout the year to Ed Tech sub-grantees in program implementation, whether receiving formula or competitive grants. In addition, technical support and assistance will be provided to all LEAs that were eligible for this competition.

and were not successful due to the funding limits. Such assistance will include workshops on writing grant proposals and developing technology plans for the next competition or other funding. Workshops to assist schools needing improvement will also be a part of the duties the Regional Training Centers will have. Site visits to these LEAs will be made to assist them on-site with their training needs and provide information on available resources. The program staff and RTCs will continue to strongly suggest partnerships to these LEAs with non-profit and for-profit entities, libraries, higher education providers, private businesses and organizations and other entities that can assist them in achieving academically and improving education for the students they serve.

**2. 7) *Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities -- reservation for the Governor (Title IV, Part A, section 4112).***

Timeline:

- |                   |                                 |
|-------------------|---------------------------------|
| • Currently       | Request for Proposals Available |
| • August, 2002    | Request for Proposals Due       |
| • September 2002  | Awards Announced                |
| • October 1, 2002 | Funds Distributed               |

The purpose of the Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities Program is to support programs that prevent violence in and around school: that prevent the illegal use of alcohol, tobacco, and drugs; that involve parents and communities, and that are coordinated with related Federal, State, school, and community efforts and resources to foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports student academic achievement. The Governor's Title IV funding is to be awarded to local educational agencies, community-based organization, other public entities and private organizations, and consortia thereof.

Grants shall be awarded based on:

- the quality of the program or activity proposed; and
- how the program or activity meets the principles of effectiveness

In making such grants and contracts, the Governor's Office shall give priority to programs and activities that prevent illegal drug use and violence for

- children and youth who are not normally served by State educational agencies or local educational agencies; or
- populations that need special services or additional resources

In awarding funds, the Governor's Office shall give special consideration to grantees that pursue a comprehensive approach to drug and violence prevention that includes providing and incorporating mental health services related to drug and violence prevention in their program. Grants or contracts awarded shall be subject to a peer review process.

The Governor's Safe and Drug Free Schools and Communities Program will fund non-school-based programs designed for the reduction and prevention of substance abuse and violence for youth. Non-school means that the program should not be part of the school day curriculum.

As a required component of the program, the applicant **MUST** work in collaboration with the local school(s) and/or district and demonstrate in this application the coordination, and not duplication, of school-based prevention efforts.

**Each applicant that receives a grant may use such funds to carry out programs that comply with the principles of effectiveness and meet the needs of the community, as identified in the Needs Assessment section of the proposal. Program activities may include the following:**

- Age appropriate and developmentally based activities that —
  - address the consequences of violence and the illegal use of drugs, as appropriate;
  - promote a sense of individual responsibility;
  - teach youth that most people do not illegally use drugs;
  - teach youth to recognize social and peer pressure to use drugs illegally and the skills for resisting illegal drug use;
  - teach youth about the dangers of emerging drugs;
  - engage youth in the learning process; and
  - incorporate activities in secondary schools that reinforce prevention activities implemented in elementary schools.
- Activities that involve families, community sectors (which may include appropriately trained seniors), and a variety of drug and violence prevention providers in setting clear expectations against violence and illegal use of drugs and appropriate consequences for violence and illegal use of drugs.
- Dissemination of drug and violence prevention information to schools and the community.
- Professional development and training for, and involvement of, school personnel, pupil services personnel, parents, and interested community members in **prevention**, education, early identification and intervention, mentoring, or rehabilitation referral, as related to drug and violence prevention.
- Drug and violence prevention activities that may include the following:
  - Community-wide planning and organizing activities to reduce violence and illegal drug use, which may include gang activity prevention.
  - Expanded and improved mental health services related to illegal drug use and violence, including early identification of violence and illegal drug use, assessment, and direct or group counseling services provided to students,

parents, families, and school personnel by qualified mental health service providers.

- Conflict resolution programs, including peer mediation programs that educate and train peer mediators and a designated faculty supervisor, and youth anti-crime and anti-drug councils and activities.
- Alternative education programs or services for violent or drug abusing students that reduce the need for suspension or expulsion or that serve students who have been suspended or expelled from the regular educational settings, including programs or services to assist students to make continued progress toward meeting the State academic achievement standards and to reenter the regular education setting.
- Counseling, mentoring, referral services, and other student assistance practices and programs, including assistance provided by qualified mental health services providers and the training of teachers by mental health services providers in appropriate identification and intervention techniques for students at risk of violent behavior and illegal use of drugs.
- Programs that encourage students to seek advice from, and to confide in, a trusted adult regarding concerns about violence and illegal drug use.
- Drug and violence prevention activities designed to reduce truancy.
- Age-appropriate, developmentally-based violence prevention and education programs that address victimization associated with prejudice and intolerance, and that include activities designed to help students develop a sense of individual responsibility and respect for the rights of others, and to resolve conflicts without violence.
- Developing and implementing character education programs, as a component of drug and violence prevention programs, that take into account the views of parents of the students for whom the program is intended and such students.
- Community service, including community service performed by expelled students, and service-learning projects.
- Programs that respond to the needs of students who are faced with domestic violence or child abuse.
- The evaluation of any of the activities authorized under this subsection and the collection of objective data used to assess program needs, program implementation, or program success in achieving program goals and objectives.

This is a one-year contract that may be renewable for two additional one-year periods, contingent upon the availability of funds. Consideration for renewal will be based on results of program and fiscal monitoring. Applicants must be able to manage financially under the reimbursement plan.

## ***2. 8) Community Service Grants (Title IV, Part A, section 4126).***

The Arizona Department of Education will not issue competitive subgrants, per USDE notification.

## **2. 9) 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (Title IV, Part B).**

### **Timelines**

Timelines have been posted on our 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Center (CCLC) website and are as follows:

ADE submits Consolidated Application to USDE	June
Develops grant application	July
Training on application	July
Applications submitted to ADE	August
Awards	October

Feedback from our advisory council suggests a later award date to allow sufficient time for Grantees. This is under consideration.

### **Selection Criteria**

The ADE will restrict awards to eligible entities that serve students who attend schools that are identified as schools in School Improvement where at least 40% of the students qualify for free/reduced meals. These applications will be screened for the capacity to administer the program, the quality of the description of need, statement of goals, academic enrichment, a sound management plan and additional services proposed to achieve program goals.

Applications proposing to provide services through the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC grant program at a non-school site must provide documentation that:

- the program will be at least as available and accessible as it would be at the school site,
- there is a clearly defined plan of communication between the alternate site and the school including
  - the alignment of the education and literacy component,
  - safe transportation between the school and the alternate site will be provided. and
  - the school and the alternate site are in agreement for the alternate site.

Grantees will be required to offer opportunities for literacy services to family members if there are no avenues for filling that need through other state and Federal programs such as Even Start/Family Literacy. Grantees will be required to participate in the USDA nutrition programs, which are operated within the same division at ADE.

ADE will solicit grant reviewers from the newly established 21<sup>st</sup> Century CLC Advisory Council as well as the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory. Grant reviewers will receive training in accordance with ARS 41-2701, which defines the rules for competitive grants. All grant reviewers will possess knowledge and experience in after-school programs.



WestEd will assist ADE with professional development. Two Arizona conferences will be utilized for professional development for grantees. These include the ADE Mega conference and the Arizona School Age Coalition conference. Training will include but is not limited to the following topics:

- Panel discussion of youth attending CLC's programs
- Programs that support standards-based reform
- Strategies linking extended learning to Arizona Academic Standards

Grantees will be required to attend if funds have been awarded.

Other training opportunities will be posted on our Web site.

ADE and WestEd will monitor jointly to determine progress toward meeting their goals and objectives. Programs, which cannot demonstrate progress, will be placed on a corrective action plan.

Grantees will also be required to submit quarterly reports to ADE.

### **Priorities and how they promote improved academic achievement**

ADE will give priority to applications that propose to serve children in schools designated in need of improvement and are submitted jointly by school districts and community-based organizations. Applications that demonstrate strong performance goals measuring progress in reading/language arts and mathematics will be awarded a greater number of points.

### **3. Describe how the State will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives**

#### **MONITORING FOR PROGRAM COMPLIANCE**

In October of 1998, the Arizona Department of Education (ADE) initiated a pilot program to help meet its monitoring requirements in accordance with 34 CFR §80, by creating a Self-Assessment document which local educational agencies (LEAs) could use to determine their compliance with the law. Based on input from pilot LEA sites, the Self-Assessment document was modified and sent to all remaining districts and charter schools within Arizona, during January 1999. After completing approximately 50 visits for the fiscal year ending June 30, 2000, the Academic Support Self-Assessment Team reconvened and determined that all LEAs could be reviewed at least once every three years. Eighty-four additional LEAs were selected to complete and/or update their Self-Assessments; an additional 84 LEAs were scheduled for visits during each of the fiscal years ending June 30, 2001 and June 30, 2002.

The ADE also has specific court-ordered responsibilities to monitor programs for English language learners (ELLs). During the current school year, the Academic Support Division developed an appendix to the Self-Assessment document for monitoring services to ELLs. The accompanying protocol was used by the Academic Support Division to monitor a group of LEAs selected from those scheduled for monitoring under the IASA programs and based on court-ordered requirements. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 2003, the IASA cycle of monitoring will be completed and a transition to program monitoring under the *NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT* (NCLB) will be initiated. It is anticipated that the court-ordered requirements for monitoring of ELL programs will be integrated into the continuation of federal program monitoring under the NCLB Act. (The Self-Assessment documents are posted on the ADE Web Site at <http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/> for the IASA Self-Assessment and <http://www.ade.az.gov/asd/lep.asp> for Appendix G - State Programs for English Learners.)

The ADE will require that applications (covering the allocations generated by formula for Title I-A, Title II-A, Title V-A and others that are consolidated by LEAs in their submissions of fiscal and programmatic data) shall contain information at the time of application which is, in fact, determined to be of sufficient scope and quantity to enable the state educational agency to conduct an initial compliance monitoring of each LEA request for program funding—including data collection on the transferability of program dollars to other authorized purposes. The existing ADE Grants Management System—featuring electronic submission, multiple amendments of programmatic and fiscal information, cash management and completion reporting, as well as procedures for review and approval of applications within the division that have oversight responsibility for ESEA programs—represents the *de facto* collaboration between the ADE and Arizona’s LEAs over the past four years.

Because of the wealth of information requested at the time of application submission, when the ADE gives its “approval” for the application that consolidates, at a minimum, Title I-A, Title II-A, and Title V-A program funding, the *initial* phase of compliance monitoring will have occurred. “Formal and comprehensive” On-site Monitoring that is assigned to ADE Education Program Specialists and contracted “monitors” shall augment general compliance monitoring. The ADE anticipates that it will need to move to a five-year On-site Monitoring Cycle under the NCLB Act due to the ever-increasing numbers of LEAs in the state and the emphasis on assuring that all LEAs provide services to the state’s growing ELL population. This change in the length of the monitoring cycle will allow other professional staff to intensify their efforts in gaining and sharing with LEAs their expertise in such areas as School Improvement, Staff Development, Parental Involvement and Innovative Strategies. It is anticipated that the first such cycle shall have been successfully completed and another already begun by the time ESEA is once again being considered for reauthorization by Congress.

In addition to the efforts of the Academic Support Division in the area of self-assessment and on-site monitoring, the ADE continues to rely on the work of outside, independent auditors where necessary. In terms of outside audits, the ADE performs the required

follow-up on any findings and questioned costs concerning ESEA programs. By way of an overview, out of a possible 434 LEAs (both traditional school districts and charter schools), approximately 135 or 31% come under the provisions of OMB Circular A-133. These 135 LEAs account for approximately 96% of the total federal education expenditures incurred. Additionally, of the 299 LEAs that are not required to have an A-133 audit, approximately 198 are charter schools, which under state law must have an annual financial statement audit conducted in accordance with generally accepted governmental auditing standards. The remaining LEAs, accounting for less than 2.5% of the Federal education dollars expended, are subject to periodic procedural review conducted by the State Auditor General's Office. When appropriate, all entities including those receiving less than \$300,000 in Federal awards are subject to a limited-scope, agreed-upon-procedures audit if the division's Self Assessment review indicates such an engagement is warranted. The Academic Support Division is notified when any LEA has received an audit determination letter outlining specific concerns with programs that the division administers. Whenever additional monitoring work is called for, an agreed-upon-procedures engagement may be requested.

#### **PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT & TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE**

Regarding the ESEA programs being consolidated under this State Application, (in particular those which fund staff development such as Title I-A, Title II-A and Title V-A), the ADE proposes providing professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's (as well as their own) performance goals and objectives under the auspices of the Arizona Professional Development Leadership Academy (PDLA). As envisioned and being implemented currently with funds granted the ADE under P.L. 105-17, *AMENDMENTS TO THE INDIVIDUALS WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1997*, the Arizona PDLA is gearing up through its web sites, Annual PDLA Summits and affiliation with the National Association of State Directors of Special Education, Inc., to provide the requisite assistance in identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research . . . *for all students and all educators*.

The mission of the PDLA is to recruit and develop both state-level and local educational agency teams who will foster supportive learning which promotes a higher standard of success for all children. The PDLA curriculum focuses on *five* interrelated disciplines—Leadership, Organizational Change, Strategic Thinking, Collaborative Partnerships, and Systems of Accountability.

**Leadership** is the discipline that involves state and local educational agency teams in the facilitation and development of new, enhanced knowledge and skills on the part of dynamic professionals who make their systems contribution as change agents. Resulting improvements in such systems include the higher levels of educational attainment for all learners through the support given talented, creative and better-prepared educators.

**Organizational Change** embodies the key factors necessary to empower all educational practitioners within a state and/or local educational agency team and causes teams to explore and identify change strategies, resulting in enhanced systems thinking as educators foster their learning communities.

**Strategic Thinking** is the prerequisite to strategic planning and strategic action. This discipline represents a learned skill that offers new options for thinking beyond current issues and concerns of individuals and the organizations which they serve. With experience and practice, state and local educational agency teams can move the organizations they represent to think strategically and create the desired future.

**Collaborative Partnerships** is the discipline concerned with the balance among leadership, support, the resources, the people, and action plans that impact all stakeholders. The PDLA curriculum identifies methods of incorporating the characteristics of successful partnerships while building successful collaborative teams at the local, regional and state levels.

**Systems of Accountability** is the component which identifies and applies guiding principles to an inclusive system addressing the process of “output vs. input” and “quality vs. quantity” as identification of measures geared to individual-learner outcomes and systems-level outcomes is undertaken.

In addition to ADE’s support for the Professional Development Leadership Academy, other collaborative, staff development models are being created. Professional development strategies for teachers in schools in need of improvement will be offered opportunities under the Title I Reading Initiative and Arizona READS which will be supported by Title II and Title V funding sources. Arizona’s focus will be to ensure that every Kindergarten through third grade teacher is an expert in teaching reading. The teaching of reading will be included in every professional development plan and will be based on student data in order to monitor progress and evaluate efforts to improve student achievement. State sponsored professional development activities will be offered to review scientifically based reading research and to examine the implications for classroom practice. Additionally, Summer Reading Academies with content designed and developed by the Texas Center for Reading and Language Arts, University of Texas at Austin will be provided to teachers. LETRS Institutes (Language Essentials for Teachers of Reading and Spelling) developed and designed by Louisa Moats, University of Texas at Houston, will examine:

- Scientifically-based reading research;
- Use of diagnostic assessment, progress monitoring and analysis of results;
- Design of customized intervention plans;
- Evaluation of reading programs;
- Mentoring and collegial coaching and follow-up; and
- Teacher advancement models.

A Model Provider Fair was held in May 2002 for the Comprehensive School Reform Demonstration Project. This fair enabled LEAs to determine which model would best address their particular demographic and academic needs. Continuation of this service will be replicated throughout reauthorization of the No Child Left Behind Act. Titles I, II and V funds may be used to support this initiative.

Coordination with West Ed (Arizona's regional comprehensive center) and Southwest Comprehensive Center has been evidenced through seminars that have been conducted periodically over the past year. These Principals' Alliance Conferences and Title I Reading Conferences have been undertaken to facilitate school improvement teams' ability to increase academic achievement. The content of the conferences have included data analysis and strategies to reform curriculum practice and delivery in the classroom. A focus at both the primary and secondary levels addresses the findings of the National Reading Panel Report. Strategies for the five essentials of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics instruction, comprehension, vocabulary and fluency in writing) are presented. This effort will be continued with cooperation from West Ed, the Southwest Comprehensive Center and will be supported by funds from Title I, Title II and Title V.

An annual IASA Mega Conference has been held for the past five years and will continue under the auspices of Titles I, II and V. A collaborative effort to include other federal programs has been undertaken for a comprehensive dissemination of information to LEAs. Each year this two-to-three day conference has increased in attendance and we foresee its continued growth.

Based upon the successful operation over many years of the Title II Eisenhower-funded Math/Science/Reading Training Centers and the equally successful Title VI-funded Rural Counties Consortium for Staff Development, a new departmental goal has been proposed:

**To Implement and Promote Standards-based Teaching & Learning through Establishment of Arizona Regional Support Centers.**

If the question were asked, "Has Arizona developed clear, concise, and measurable academic standards?" the answer would be "Yes." Arizona's Academic Standards have been recognized as among the best in the nation. However, rigorous standards, though critical, are only the first step in raising student achievement. If one were to question whether all Arizona children have access to these standards as evidenced by rising student achievement scores, the answer would be "Not yet."

**A growing body of evidence identifies the quality of the teacher in the classroom as the single, most significant factor in raising student achievement, shown in recent studies to be of greater impact than all other factors combined.**

The Arizona Department of Education (ADE) is committed to providing support and assistance to educators in the implementation of the Standards. With limited resources, the department has developed and offered standards-based professional development opportunities since 1996, when the standards were adopted. The ADE continues to seek ways to support the work of schools across state in the implementation of the Arizona

Academic Standards, to offer professional development which is designed to meet the needs of teachers, to communicate that support in a clear manner, and to deliver instructional materials in a timely fashion. In pursuit of this goal, we recognize, at the same time, that we have potential collaborative partners who are anxious to support reform and who assert that they possess “underutilized resources.” In fact, many are already involved in this work through rural consortiums at the local level.

The solution seems clear: a network of Regional Support Centers in partnership with the ADE that provides an equitable, localized delivery system of support for Standards-based Teaching & Learning. Throughout the state, some County School Superintendents are encouraging use of research-based practices, advising and entering into exchanges of information with district superintendents and charter school administrators. To greater or lesser degree, educational professionals working at County School Offices are knowledgeable about local schools, teachers and students in ways that ADE may be unable to duplicate. Being proposed is a partnership between ADE and the Offices of the County School Superintendent to leverage federal funds under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA) that are already targeted to raise student achievement through teacher education and professional development.

#### **4. Describe the Statewide system of support under section 1117 for ensuring that all schools meet the State’s academic content and student achievement standards, including how the State will provide assistance to low-performing schools.**

##### **Statewide System of School Support**

**Level 1 Priority.** ADE has established a statewide system of intensive and sustained support for school improvement. Like our preceding system, which focused on schoolwide programs as well as schools in need of improvement, the System of School Support 2002 is committed to and reflects the key *No Child Left Behind Act of 2001* goal of improved achievement for all students. This will ensure that all students will have the opportunity to meet the state’s content standards and student performance standards. Using a tiered approach to establish and provide a Statewide System of School Support, the ADE recognizes two levels of priority: A Level I Priority are those LEAs with schools farthest away from achieving the Arizona Academic Standards. These low-performing schools qualify for the Title I School Improvement Grant and, if applicable, the Comprehensive School Reform Grant. In order to support capacity, these schools are required to utilize the expertise of External Facilitators, Principals’ Alliance, and LEA staff (central office staff). Below is a brief description of External Facilitators and Principals’ Alliance.

**External Facilitators.** ADE has established External Facilitators (EFs) to work with low-performing schools. External Facilitators are expected to have a range of skills related to effective school improvement planning. They need to be knowledgeable about Arizona Academic Standards and the state assessment system in addition to having a range of

facilitation skills. The Academic Support Division will review applications to determine eligibility and will select and provide professional development for them. External Facilitators will be listed on an “approved” list to be disseminated to the eligible LEAs. Once approved, external facilitators will be expected to assist schools to analyze data, plan for school improvement using specific approaches from the *Arizona School Improvement Guide* (which can be found at [www.az.gov/asd/TitleI/accountabilitygrants](http://www.az.gov/asd/TitleI/accountabilitygrants)) and implement strategies that are believed to impact student achievement. To date, 61 EFs are listed on the ADE website and are available for support to schools.

Principals’ Alliance. Alignment with a school’s strategic direction and school staff is a critical components to the design of the Principals’ Alliance. Developed in cooperation with WestEd Phoenix Office of the Southwest Comprehensive Center, the idea of comprehensive school reform and planning was the focus of the Alliance. The principal and leadership teams from schools in school improvement were part of an intensive training in the areas of resource allocation, data analysis to inform instruction, standards-based practice and comprehensive reading instruction.

**Level 2 Priority.** The second tier on the Statewide System of School Support, is defined as a Level 2 Priority. Leas with schools identified as Level 2 Priority, although considered low performing, are not eligible to receive the Title I School Improvement Grant and, therefore, require other forms of technical support for their programs. In order to operationalize this system the ADE Academic Support Division will join with Exceptional Student Services (ESS) in their Support Cadre. This cadre will serve as our Statewide System of School Support for Level 2 Priority. The cadre will be comprised of selected distinguished educators who have been successful in improving academic achievement representing the K-12 classroom, special education, psychology, administrative personnel, pupil services personnel, faculty from institutions of higher education, education service agencies, parents, private providers which promote scientifically-based technical assistance, and other related services. To qualify for the cadre, one must be knowledgeable about scientifically-based research and practice on teaching and learning and about successful schoolwide projects, school reform, and improving educational opportunities for low-achieving students.

Administrators, teachers, ADE staff and other peer consultants will identify team participants using a referral process. To provide organizational coordination of the cadre, a member of the Academic Support Division will work with ESS in matching teams with low-performing schools in need of guidance.

The functions of the assigned teams will be to provide the following:

- Review and analyz all facets of the school’s operation, including the design and operation of the instructional program, and assist the school in developing recommendations for improving student performance in that school;
- Collaborate with parents and school staff and the LEA in the design, implementation, and monitoring of a plan that, if fully implemented, can reasonably be expected to improve student performance and help the school meet its goals for improvement, including adequate yearly progress;

- Evaluate, at least semiannually, the effectiveness of school personnel assigned to the school, including identifying outstanding teachers and principals, and make findings and recommendations to the school, the LEA, and if necessary, ADE; and
- Make additional recommendations to the LEA and ADE regarding any further assistance that is needed.

**Priority Determination.** The accountability measures expressed in AZLEARNs, in conjunction with the statutory requirements of NCLB, require that school be rank-ordered based upon performance indicators such as AIMS and Stanford 9. Those schools farthest away from meeting the Arizona Academic Standards will be identified as Level 1 Priority schools. Level 2 Priority schools will be identified and rank-ordered contingent upon performance indicators accordingly aligned to AZLEARNs and NCLB.

## **5. Describe the activities the State will conduct to--**

***5. a Help Title I schools make effective use of schoolwide programs to improve the achievement of all students, including specific steps the SEA is taking and will take to modify or eliminate State fiscal and accounting barriers so that schools can easily consolidate federal, State, and local funds for schoolwide programs;***

- ADE will identify exemplary schoolwide programs (SWPs) in the state and elicit their support in providing assistance to fledgling and struggling programs in their area. The goal is to identify successful SWPs in close proximity to other SWPs experiencing challenges and requiring local assistance.
- Establish a SWP consortium with monthly meetings throughout the state providing guest speakers and training, which will address improving a SWP, current information and related issues.
- Elicit volunteers from the Committee of Practitioners to become “experts” in the area of SWPs. Such representatives would be charged with providing technical assistance and information as it pertains to the improvement and establishment of SWPs., while working in close collaboration with ADE Education Program Specialists
- Provide SWP academies to disseminate information and facilitate training.
- ADE will amend its current website to provide information and links on operating SWP programs for the purpose of communicating with LEAs and recognizing effective LEA programs throughout the state.
- ADE has implemented an electronic grants tracking system that allows recipients to enter and track their grants on-line, which permits LEAs and schools to retain control over their programs and identify movement of funds.
- ADE has identified fiscal or accounting barriers that prevent or interfere with an LEAs or school’s ability to combine or consolidate local, State, or federal funds for purposes of an SWP.



**5. b *Ensure that all teachers, particularly those in high-poverty areas and those in schools in need of improvement, are highly qualified.***

The ADE will continue to operate the Arizona Education Employment Board (AEEB), which is available on the ADE website. School districts and charter schools throughout the state advertise jobs at this website. It is available to teachers and administrators from throughout the world who are searching for employment in Arizona. The Arizona Education Employment Board can be found at <http://www.arizonaeducationjobs.com>.

The ADE is reviewing its certification rules to determine which rules are in need of revision to ensure that the system provides for the certification of the most highly qualified individuals. Rule Revisions will be recommended to the State Board of Education as new rules are developed, or existing rules are revised.

An automated teacher certification process is currently under development. When completed, it will be possible for teacher and professional certification applicants to apply for certification electronically from their home or employment site. This will greatly expedite dissemination of the requirements for application and speed processing of certificates. In addition, this system will accommodate applications for reciprocity certificates from out-of-state teachers and administrators.

The Arizona Troops to Teachers program will continue to recruit highly qualified teachers from the ranks of retired military personnel by providing extensive public announcements, articles, presentations, workshops, job fairs, and visits to military services installations.

**5. c *Ensure that all paraprofessionals (excluding those working with parents or as translators) attain the qualifications stated in sections 1119(c) and (d) by the 2005-2006 school year.***

Designing and implementing effective professional development for teachers and paraprofessionals has as its focus—improved student achievement. Just as students are held to challenging content and performance standards, paraprofessionals are now required to possess academic qualifications. In Arizona, the qualifications required of paraprofessionals vary from LEA to LEA. To measure the extent of qualifications and the number of paraprofessionals, the ADE will require the Title II Teacher/Paraprofessional Needs Assessment results as part of the Consolidated Application. The ADE will then have a baseline from which we can determine our LEA/ADE statewide targets. The ADE is committed to:

- Assisting LEAs with a professional development framework that will focus on staffing qualifications;
- Providing references and resources for LEAs that will further support paraprofessional qualifications;

- Linking a combination of strategies, i.e., higher education initiatives, an LEA teacher/paraprofessional support network and public-private partnerships that can be supported over time; and
- Supporting technology for professional learning. The ADE will work with the Arizona State University Arizona School Services Through Educational Technology (ASSET) program in supporting paraprofessional training.

At this time, the ADE is investigating the need for a formal statewide assessment. This decision will be part of our ongoing planning and will be reported in our May 2003 application.

***5. d Help LEAs with a high need for technology, high percentages or numbers of children in poverty, and low-performing schools to form partnerships with other LEAs, institutions of higher education (IHEs), libraries, and other private and public for-profit and non-profit entities with technology expertise to improve the use of technology in instruction.***

The Regional Training Centers(RTCs)will provide professional development training on curriculum integration and staff resources at schools identified as high poverty, schools in need of improvement, and those needing corrective action. The RTCs will provide LEAs with specific training on how to use and search for appropriate titles that address AZ State Standards via the State funded ASP (Active Server Page, offering over 250 software titles to Arizona teachers and students with 24-hours per day access).

***Comprehensive Implementation Grants***, only an eligible local entity that is either a “high-need local educational agency” or an “eligible local partnership” may apply. A “high-need local educational agency” is an LEA that –

- (1) Is among those LEAs in the State with the highest numbers or percentages of children from families with incomes below the poverty line; ***AND***
- (2) Serves one or more schools identified for improvement or corrective action under section 1116 of the ESEA, or has a substantial need for assistance in acquiring and using technology.

In Arizona, for the purposes of this Ed Tech Grant, we will be using Title I data and determine that any LEA with an average of 60% or higher of their students in poverty, may be considered eligible to apply for the Comprehensive Implementation Competitive Grant.

An “eligible local partnership” is a partnership project that can clearly show its benefit to the high need LEA and includes at least one of the following

- (1) An LEA that can demonstrate that teachers in its schools are effectively integrating technology and proven teaching practices into instruction, based on a review of relevant research, and that the integration results in

improvement in classroom instruction and in helping students meet challenging academic standards.

- (2) An institution of higher education that is in full compliance with the reporting requirements of section 207(f) of the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended, and that has not been identified by the State as low-performing under the act.
- (3) A for-profit business or organization that develops, designs, manufactures, or produces technology products or services or has substantial expertise in the application of technology in instruction.
- (4) A public or private nonprofit organization with demonstrated expertise in the application of education technology in instruction.
- (5) May also include other LEAs, educational service agencies, libraries, or other educational entities appropriate to provide local programs.

#### **Special Consideration for Comprehensive Implementation Grant Applications:**

Consideration by way of 20 extra points will be given to projects that:

- Address Arizona State initiatives: AZ READS and AZ LEARNS. or
- Would receive less than \$5,000 of the Title I formula funding for Ed Tech; or
- Include schools identified by ADE as needing improvement or corrective action.

#### ***5. e Promote parental and community participation in schools.***

ADE will engage in the following activities to promote parental and community participation in schools:

- Create a state consortium of parents and community members for the purpose of increasing partnerships and developing an understanding of the vital role parents and community members have in public education.
- Amend the ADE website to include links to organizations which sponsor and support parent/community involvement in public education.
- Partner with county and state institutions of higher learning to promote coursework, which emphasizes parent/community involvement in public education.
- Convene regional annual parent/community involvement conferences.
- Through the Title I monitoring process, ensure LEAs and schools have current parental involvement policies and compacts which conform to the NCLB guidelines,
- Provide technical assistance to those LEAs and schools lacking a policy or compact or that received a corrective action on their monitoring visit.

In addition, the ADE program divisions encourage participation in the following ways:

- 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers (CCLC) grants will give priority to applicants who include schools in school improvement, working jointly with Community Based Organizations. Literacy services for parents will also be a part of the 21<sup>st</sup> CCLC applications.
- Parents in Family Literacy programs often serve as classroom aides as part of the community service component.
- Family Literacy staff and members of the mentoring teams coach school personnel on the effective use and positive impact of parent/community volunteers.
- Adult Education instruction is grounded in the context of the family, the community and the workplace, providing constant reinforcement to parents on the importance of their role in educating their children.
- English literacy for parents is presented in the context of civics, with much emphasis on the participation by the parents in their child's school
- Parents in both Family Literacy and Adult Education serve as educational role models for their children.
- Parents in Family Literacy and Adult Education programs are taught the critical role they play in their children's success in school.
- Parents in Family Literacy programs become advocates for their children's school in the community.
- Through Family Literacy and Adult Education programs, print materials are introduced into the homes of young children.
- Parents in Family Literacy and Adult Education classes learn how to advocate for and influence their children's best interests both in school and community settings.
- Parents of special needs children gain an awareness of educational accommodations they can employ to help their children.
- Parents in Family Literacy and Adult Education programs gain insight into meeting the challenges in life that can interfere with their children's education.
- Family Literacy programs promote supportive family relationships.
- Academic standards are in place for Early Childhood and Adult Education. Both sets of standards are aligned to the Arizona K-12 Standards and will help parents of young children understand their educational progress, from the earliest formal education through high school or its equivalent.

***5. f Describe the activities the State will conduct to secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core ESEA accountability system.***

The ADE will secure the baseline and follow-up data for the core accountability system by:

- administering State assessments to all students;
- collecting student demographic data *and*
- collecting Student enrollment data.

It is important to remember that the cornerstone of the State's accountability system is the achievement profile, which utilizes these data. The State recognizes the importance of securing these data and has implemented a legal mechanism to make certain that all public schools, including charter schools, submit these data in a complete and timely manner to the ADE and our contracted testing company. Schools found in non-compliance face severe consequences, such as the loss of monies from the classroom site fund. Under ARS §15-241,<sup>12</sup> "Each school shall submit to the department any data that is required and requested and is necessary to compile the achievement profile. A school that fails to submit the information that is necessary is not eligible to receive monies from the classroom site fund."

Understanding the importance of assessment data in relationship to the accountability system established under AZ LEARNS and the objectives of NCLB, the ADE has implemented several improvements designed to increase the accurate and timely reporting of assessment data. Improvements include, but are not limited to, the hiring of two directors of assessment (one to manage the operational aspects of the State's assessment program and the other to supervise the technical quality of the program), funding appropriated specifically for the purpose of increasing the ADE's capacity to collect, analyze and report assessment data, and contracting with a new testing company. In addition, the ADE has initiated several quality control measures to enhance the technical merit of the State's assessment program. These initiatives include, but are not limited to, contractual provisions with our current testing company (including an errors and omissions clause enforced with strict monetary penalties), collaboration with State university faculty in the review of assessment data and the completion of validity studies, and the formation of a National Technical Advisory Committee.

It is important to note that ADE is currently examining all inconsistencies between AZ LEARNS and NCLB in order to establish congruency between the two. One such inconsistency involves the issue of timing resulting from the achievement profile date of October 15, annually as stipulated by ARS§15-241 and the Title I requirement to identify all schools for improvement by the beginning of the school year. While all test data (AIMS and Stanford 9) is currently returned by the beginning of the academic year, the ADE is investigating possible resolutions (either through State statute or contractual provisions with the State's testing company) in order to meet all related NCLB requirements.

The ADE intends to disaggregate assessment data (as required by ESEA, Title I) based on student self-reported information obtained from non-test indicators answered on the Stanford 9 and AIMS testing documents. Furthermore, the ADE is currently investigating indicators that will accurately and adequately assess the socio-economic status (SES) of the State's student population in order to fulfill the Title I mandate to disaggregate student data.

---

<sup>12</sup> Complete text of ARS §15-241 can be found at [www.azleg.state.az.us/ars](http://www.azleg.state.az.us/ars).

## **6. Describe how:**

### ***6. a. SEA officials and staff consulted with the Governor's office in the development of the State plan;***

The Superintendent of Public Instruction, the Director of Educational Programs, and ADE staff have met frequently with members of the Governor's staff to coordinate the development of this application.

### ***6. b. State officials and staff will coordinate the various ESEA-funded programs with State-level activities the State administers;***

The Director of Educational Programs, who oversees federal and state educational programs, is a member of the Executive Team. This Executive Team meets weekly to coordinate activities within the ADE as well as the pending legislation at the Arizona Legislature and to assure support for the initiatives of the Superintendent of Public Instruction.

### ***6. c. State officials and staff will coordinate with other organizations, such as businesses, IHEs, nonprofit organizations;***

The ADE, on a regular basis, coordinates activities with business, non-profit organizations, and institutions of higher education. The Director of Operations for the Academic Support Division, who in conjunction with the Program Director for Academic Support, oversees most of the ESEA programs in Arizona, belongs to the Arizona Board of Directors for Community Colleges as the State Superintendent designee. In that capacity, he represents the department and its programs, including ESEA programs, before the community college system in the State. The Community Colleges Board includes members from each of the Community College districts of the State of Arizona and the Arizona State Board of Regents that oversees the three state universities.

The Director of Operations for Academic Support is also a member of the Arizona Minority Education Policy Analysis Center (AMEPAC), which is a branch of the Arizona Post Secondary Education Commission, and the Teacher Education Partnership Commission, which is administered by the Maricopa Community College District.

These two organizations have members representing business, higher education professionals, community college staff, school district staff, private non-profit organizations, teachers and administrators. Through this coordination, the department has been able to inform and acquire input from these organizations on the requirements of ESEA. This has resulted in the Arizona Community College system and the three universities collaborating to begin the process of developing preparation programs for paraprofessionals that hope to be employed by Title I programs.

The Maricopa Community College system is currently seeking authorization to offer an Associate of Arts Degree in Education (see **Appendix, Attachment 4**). This would enable students to receive specific instruction in assisting the teaching of reading, writing and math, as well as receiving instruction in teaching methodology, assessment and classroom management.

***6. d . State officials and staff will coordinate with other agencies, including the Governor's office, and with other Federal programs (including those authorized by Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act).***

All directors of federal programs including ESEA, Career/Technical Education, Adult Education, Exceptional Student Services, and Student Services, meet bi-monthly to coordinate activities and to share information. In recent weeks, a jointly funded position has been established to encourage high school students to enter the teaching profession. Other positions are being considered.

ADE staff serve on advisory committees and work groups with other agencies, including the Department of Economic Security, Department of Health Services, Department of Commerce, and Division of Vocational Rehabilitation.

ADE serves on the Governor's Head Start Advisory Council Committee which has been organized to focus on the following three critical areas:

**Professional Development:** Maintain a registry of Child Care and Early Education Practitioners in Arizona; as well as a current list of statewide trainings.

**Quality and cost:** Upgrade the rates paid to early childhood professionals to reflect the most current market rate and change the state definition of full day to five hours.

**Health committee:** Ensure all Head Start children have medical homes.

The number of children without medical homes has been identified. Strategies to find homes, including school based clinics and community health centers, have been identified.

**7. Describe the strategies the State will use to determine, on a regular basis, whether LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees are making satisfactory progress in meeting State and local goals and desired program outcomes. In doing so, the SEA should also describe how it will use data it gathers from subgrantees on how well they are meeting State performance targets, and the actions the State will take to determine or revise interventions for any LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees that are not making substantial progress.**

The ADE has developed strategies which determine whether LEAs are making satisfactory progress in meeting their annual measurable goals as described and adopted in their Local Consolidated Plans. Until December 2002, when a statewide needs assessment on levels of technical assistance has been completed, the ADE will employ the intermediate strategies described below:

- The ADE will design and conduct regional workshops on the development and writing of an LEA Consolidated Plan that integrates federal program requirements for the sources of funding included in this State Application.
- The ADE will conduct a rigorous review of LEA Consolidated Plans prior to approval.
- To increase public awareness and provide an additional degree of accountability LEA Consolidated Plans will be submitted on-line and will be available, following the approval process, for examination and subsequent modifications.
- LEAs shall be required to report their progress toward meeting performance targets specified in their approved Consolidated Plans.
- The ADE will evaluate each LEA's progress and construct the technical assistance response required if targets have not been met. The ADE will further define the levels of technical assistance and intervention by the ADE and our collaborative partners.
- The ADE will ensure that professional development activities funded under the approved LEA Consolidated Application are consistent with the definition provided under section 9101(34).
- If an LEA fails to respond to ADE recommendations and presents ample evidence of noncompliance, the LEA Consolidated Application shall be suspended and funding for all ESEA Titles will be withheld until a new application and all programmatic data can be renegotiated.
- The ADE will design data collection systems (especially in the area of an LEAs' reporting its results locally after completion of the initial Professional Development Needs Assessment) or import data from established systems to determine the levels of technical assistance which LEAs require in order to meet their performance targets.
- The ADE will provide services to LEAs and schools identified for improvement under the State's accountability system. The ADE will utilize established technology networks to disseminate scientifically based research (SBR) to these LEAs and schools.



## PART III: ESEA KEY PROGRAMMATIC REQUIREMENTS AND FISCAL INFORMATION

### 1. Title I, Part A -- Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs [Goals 1,2,3,5]

*1. a Identify the amount of the reservation in section 1003(a) for school improvement that the State will use for State-level activities and describe those activities.*

The ADE will reserve \$3,443,670 for State-level school improvement activities. Ninety-five percent (95%) of these funds will be allocated to schools that are identified as farthest from meeting state goals in reading/language arts and mathematics and their current status. The 5% remainder of these funds will be used for administration purposes, including funding for a school improvement coordinator. Additional technical assistance, on-site monitoring and professional development will be available to schools and districts that receive school improvement funds.

*1. b For the 95 percent of the reservation in section 1003(a) that must be made available to LEAs, describe how the SEA will allocate funds to assist LEAs in complying with the school improvement, corrective action, and restructuring requirements of section 1116 and identify any SEA requirements for use of those funds.*

To make the determination of schools most in need of improvement, ADE will examine the Adequate Yearly Progress reports based on AZ LEARNS and generate a list of schools with the largest gaps between state goals for student achievement in reading/language arts and mathematics and their current status. These schools will be eligible to apply for a minimum \$30,000 School Improvement Grant to engage in the school improvement planning process.

To receive these funds, the LEA's **administrator** must commit to the following conditions:

- Use a portion of the grant funds to *contract with an external facilitator* selected by the school from the ADE-approved External Facilitator list. The external facilitator must contract with the school to examine student test scores, needs assessment data, history of school improvement efforts, budget allocation, the LEA consolidated plan, and other factors associated with school reform, and assist the school in formulating a school improvement plan.
- *Revise the LEA consolidated plan* to indicate how the LEA will support its schools as they engage in school improvement.
- *Attend awareness/professional development sessions* on how coordinators can help support school improvement efforts.
- *Complete and sign* the Open Enrollment Policy Declaration. This declaration will then be submitted to ADE.

In addition, the **school** must agree to the following:

- *Select, contract, and work with an ADE-approved external facilitator;*
- *Develop a school improvement plan as specified in the Arizona School Improvement Guide;*
- *Provide in-depth, frequent professional development for instructional staff and leaders based on school needs and focused on instructional strategies and content;*
- *Implement research-based strategies that show a strong relationship with student achievement (such as intensive one-on-one tutoring, alignment of curriculum with state standards, examining and using data for improvement); and*
- *Attend ADE school improvement training (Principals' Alliance and school improvement team training).*

***1. c Identify what part, if any, of State administrative funds the SEA will use for assessment development under section 1004 of the ESEA, and describe how those funds will be used.***

ADE will not use funds for assessment development under this part.

***1. d Describe how the State will inform LEAs of the procedures they must use to distribute funds for schools to use for supplemental services under section 1116(e)(6) and (7) and the procedures for determining the amount to be used for this purpose.***

ADE will not use funds reserved under 1116(e)(6) and (7) to assist LEAs that do not have sufficient funds to provide supplemental services for eligible students.

***1. e Describe how the State will use the formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111.***

The ADE intends to use formula funds awarded under 6113(b)(1) to further the development of State assessments, specifically AIMS, in order to meet ESEA Title I requirements. This includes, but is not limited to the following activities<sup>13</sup>:

- 1) Item development
- 2) Field testing
- 3) Operational testing
- 4) Technical reports
- 5) Validity studies
- 6) Item analysis
- 7) Scaling
- 8) Item review

---

<sup>13</sup> Please refer to Appendix, Attachment 1c for further details concerning the grades and subjects to be assessed through the State's assessment program.

Formula funds will also be used to establish and maintain State assessment review committees to conduct item reviews, content reviews, and bias reviews. In addition, the ADE will convene a National Technical Advisory Committee to provide advice on the development and implementation of the Arizona assessment program and related policies. The ADE will also develop and maintain an item bank. Formula funds will be used to improve the scoring and reporting of State assessment data.

## **2. Title I, Part B, Subpart 3 -- Even Start Family Literacy [Goals 1,2,5]**

### ***2. a Describe how the SEA will use its indicators of program quality to monitor, evaluate, and improve its projects, and to decide whether to continue operating them.***

Arizona's Even Start Family Literacy programs will be monitored and evaluated as to how well they meet the State's Indicators of Program Quality.

- During the 2001-2002 year, the Even Start indicators of program quality have been piloted. Data forthcoming in June, will determine whether initial targets are realistic yet significantly challenging. It is anticipated that revised goals and expectations will be established for future years.
- The Arizona Even Start community may identify additional Performance Indicators to advance Arizona's continuous improvement process. These would also be aligned with the Early Childhood Education (ECE) Standards. Examples include: age-appropriate attendance expectations for infants, toddlers, pre-schoolers, and school-aged children; redefining "advancement to the next level; and realignment of kindergarten readiness, when a new ECE Assessment tool is selected.

### ***2. b Describe what constitutes sufficient program progress when the SEA makes continuation awards.***

Arizona uses the following monitoring activities to ensure a systematic approach to program accountability, improvement and quality assurances:

- Indicators of Program Quality (IPQ) – Self Assessment
- Individual Program Plans
- Narrative Summaries
- State Indicators of Quality
- Desk Audits (Timeliness and Accuracy of Reporting)
- On-site Visits
- Data System Reports and Report Cards
- State Technical Assistance Reviews and Progress toward Plans
- Negotiated Performance Levels
- Technical Assistance
- Sanctions
- Defunding

Arizona considers the following factors in identifying significant program progress for local Even Start Programs:

### **YEARS ONE AND TWO**

Progress based upon:

- Status of Recruitment and Retention of Families
- Integration of Program Components
- Staff Integration, Teamwork and Commitment (Blending of partner agencies philosophies and goals toward common outcomes)
- Academic Progress: (ECE and Adult Education Standards and Curriculum Integration)
- Achievement of 80% of expected Performance Targets

### **YEARS THREE AND FOUR**

Quality Improvement based upon:

- Meeting Needs of Students
- Fully Integrating Program Components
- Curriculum Aligned with Adult Education and Family Literacy Standards
- Exceeding Performance Outcomes
- Utilizing Student-level Data for On-going Continuous Improvement, Informed Instruction, Student Centered Learning and Professional Development for Staff
- Fully Integrating with LEA Goals and Outcomes
- Demonstrating Creative and Innovative Activities and Community Service

***2. c Explain how the State's Even Start projects will provide assistance to low-income families participating in the program to help children in those families to achieve to the applicable State content and student achievement standards.***

Ninety-two percent of Arizona's Family Literacy families are of Hispanic background with limited English skills. Thus, the first step in helping their children to achieve the Arizona Academic Standards in school is in developing a trusting relationship with the parent. It is then helpful to assist them in solving some of their basic needs/challenges. As the parents begin to build their own comfort levels and literacy skills, it is possible to strengthen their abilities to assist and to support their children's school needs and progress.

- Reinforce with Parents:
  1. That they are their child's first and most important teachers
  2. Their understanding of age appropriate expectations
  3. That as they improve their own academic skills, they become positive role models for their child's school success
  4. The importance/value of motivating and supporting their child's progress in school

- For Parents of Even Start and Family Literacy Toddlers and Pre-School Children
  1. Assist in building English Acquisition skills
  2. Build excitement for the love of learning (creativity, self-expression)
  3. Lay foundations and early activities for (English) Linguistic Awareness and Conversation, Early Reading Skills, and Emergent Writing
  4. Encourage parents to provide transitions to home literacy activities and to build awareness of the “windows of opportunities” for learning (brain research)
- For Parents of School-aged Children of Low-Income Families:
  1. Teach parents how to assist their children with homework
  2. Teach parents about school standards and expectations
  3. Encourage parents to foster on-going conversations and activities/games that reinforce reading and other literacy related skills, critical and problem solving strategies and creative expression
  4. Encourage parental involvement in school activities
  5. Teach the value of monitoring school attendance and grades
  6. Show parents how to advocate for their children

***2. d Identify the amount of the reservation under subsection 1233(a) that the State will use for each category of State-level activities listed in that section, and describe how the SEA will carry out those activities.***

The amount of reservation by category:

Administration:	3.0 %	\$ 110,757
State Leadership & Technical Assistance	3.0%	110,758
Program Allocations	94.0%	3,470,406

State-level funding categories and included activities:

**Administration:** Arizona staffing and support costs to administer local grants, provide monitoring, program improvement and technical assistance activities.

**State Leadership & Technical Assistance:** Phase II of the Arizona Early Childhood Education Standards Initiative was planned. However, since USDE is cutting state leadership funding by 50% for the next two fiscal years, only some of the planned activities will be undertaken, based upon available funding:

1. Local program curriculum alignment to Arizona ECE Standards
2. Development of Parent and Child Together (PACT) Standards
3. Implementation of Student-level data reporting at the ECE level
4. Professional Development for Program Directors, Instructional and Support Staff

### **3. Title I, Part C -- Education of Migrant Children [Goals 1,2,5]**

***3. a Describe the process the State will use to develop, implement, and document a comprehensive needs assessment that identifies the special educational and related needs of migrant children.***

The State is currently completing and compiling a Comprehensive Migrant Needs Assessment that documents and identifies the unique educational and related needs of migrant students. The State has contracted with an outside entity to conduct a comprehensive needs assessment by gathering critical data, analyzing the data collected, and preparing a document that shows the needs of migrant students. The first phase of the Needs Assessment started in March 2002, with distributing and collecting surveys and conducting focus groups with family/parent liaisons, migrant parents, migrant students, administrators of migrant programs, principals and teachers of migrant students. The surveys requested critical information and included an opportunity for participants to offer further comment on any area being surveyed as well as on any relevant issues not being surveyed. The surveys, along with other important data, will be compiled and analyzed to determine and prioritize student and parent educational and social needs statewide and locally.

***3. b Describe the State's priorities for the use of migrant education program funds in order to have migrant students meet the State's performance targets for indicators 1.1 and 1.2 in Part I (as well as 5.1 and 5.2 that expressly include migrant students), and how they relate to the State's assessment of needs for services.***

In April 2002, the State assessment data was disaggregated by subgroups, including migrant students, to determine the number of migrant students who are at or above the Proficient level in reading/language arts and mathematics in each school. Migrant students falling below the Proficient level were also identified and targeted to receive intense supplemental services supplied by migrant education program funds in addition to those services provided to all children who fall below the Proficient level on the State assessment.

The ADE compiles data on the percentage of students who drop out of school by migrant status, race, ethnicity, gender, disability status, English proficiency, and status as economically disadvantaged; calculated in the same manner as used in National Center for Education Statistics reports on Common Core of Data.

The data from these reports are included in the State's needs assessment. The State will identify areas where drop-out programs should be placed, the specific students needing intervention for reading/language arts and mathematics as well as schools that have a special need for outside assistance in working with their migrant students. Funds will be prioritized and targeted to provide interventions to strengthen these identified areas.

**3. c Describe how the State will determine the amount of any subgrants the State will award to local operating agencies, taking into account the numbers and needs of migrant children, the statutory priority for service in section 1304(d), and the availability of funds from other federal, State, and local programs.**

Based on a comprehensive application and service delivery plan process, schools with 15 or more migrant students enrolled are eligible to receive a Migrant Education subgrant. The amount of these subgrants is determined by a cost per pupil allocation as well as a weighted formula. The weighted formula provides additional funds for those students most at risk of failing to meet Arizona's challenging academic content standards and challenging student academic achievement standards and whose education has been interrupted during the regular school year. In addition to migrant student enrollment, the factors that weight the allocation are: limited English proficiency, number of interruptive moves, proximity of LEA (remoteness of the district), participants, residents, and Title I services.

**TIMELINE FOR AWARDING MIGRANT EDUCATION SUBGRANTS**

<b>DATE</b>	<b>ACTIVITY</b>	<b>RESPONSIBLE</b>
January 15 of each year	Student data for allocation purposes is reported.	Data Collection Center
February of each year	Data is verified by ADE, Data Collection Center and LEA	Data Collection Center
March of each year	After revisions and adjustments to verification, report comes back to ADE	Data Collection Center
April of each year	ADE compiles data for final LEA allocation	ADE
June of each year	Arizona's allocation from OME is finalized	OME
June of each year	LEAs are notified of amount of allocations	ADE
July of each year	LEAs submit grant applications and service delivery plans based on formula to ADE	LEA
July /August of each year	Application and service delivery plans are reviewed, revised by LEA and processed	LEAs and ADE
August/September of each year	Funds are distributed	ADE

In order for the LEA to receive Migrant Education funds, its application and service delivery plan must show activities that promote improved academic achievement. The following selection criteria for approval of applications and plans must be included.

- Description of opportunities for migrant students to meet Arizona Academic Standards.
- Description of provisions to meet the special needs of students who enroll or withdraw during the regular school terms.
- Description of how migrant students are included the appropriate services provided by Title I, Part A and English Acquisition education programs.
- Description of support services that will allow migrant students to participate effectively in the regular classroom.
- Description of opportunities for additional credit accrual for credit-deficient high school migrant students.
- Description of parent involvement activities, i.e., parent nights, Advisory Council and Committees.

At the end of the project year a completion report is made to ADE that evaluates the effectiveness of these activities.

***3. d Describe how the State will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migrant children.***

Arizona will promote continuity of education and the interstate and intrastate coordination of services for migrant students through the State's Migrant Data Collection System for student records (which is equipped to follow the migrant students as they move from district to district throughout the state as well as from state to state). When a migrant student moves, it is not always made known to the sending school until the student shows up in another district; however, with the new national system for sharing migrant student information, to be effective in April 2003, the receiving district, whether out of state or within state can gain immediate access to the students' records so that services and programs needed by students can continue without interruption.

***3. e Describe the State's plan to evaluate the effectiveness of its migrant education program and projects.***

Using the State System of School Support and the results of the Migrant Needs Assessment, Arizona is in the process of designing a comprehensive evaluation plan to determine the effectiveness of the migrant education programs and projects. It is planned that the evaluation be of sufficient high quality and rigor to be instructive in improving program effectiveness. It is planned that the evaluation ensure that each migrant student receives all services to which he/she is entitled. There is coordination of school programs to serve migrant students. Programs and interventions provided for migrant students must be scientifically research based as being effective for migrant students. Migrant student outcomes are measured on two assessments administered statewide each year. Evaluation of English language proficiency, reading/language skills, mathematic skills, as well as other academic skills, will be conducted periodically throughout the school year



to ensure migrant students are not left behind and immediate intervention can take place if the student is identified as not meeting academic expectations.

The purpose of the evaluation is to provide data on programs so that ineffective programs can be replaced and effective programs can be strengthened.

***3. f Identify the amount of funds that the SEA will retain from its Migrant Education Program (MEP) allocation, under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations (34 CFR 200.41), to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to the MEP, and describe how the SEA will use those funds.***

Arizona will retain 18.5% of the Migrant Education Program(MEP) allocation under section 200.41 of the Title I regulations to carry out administrative and program functions that are unique to MEP. Arizona will use a portion of the funds for Statewide Services to operates the technology system for keeping records on each eligible migrant student. Statewide Services hires needed consultants to assist with training for migrant education workers. Currently, several grants that assist the migrant program in helping the academic achievement of students are also provided with these funds. Arizona will be using the results of the 2002 Migrant Needs Assessment to determine which programs will continue and which additional programs should be funded to make Migrant Education more effective.

#### **4. Title I, Part D -- Children and Youth who are Neglected, Delinquent, or At-Risk [Goals 1,2,5**

***4. a Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving the academic and vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program.***

#### **GOALS**

The ADE supports educational projects and services that address the following goals:

- Services provided to children and youth identified by the ADE as failing, or most at risk of failing to meet Arizona's challenging academic content standards and student academic achievement goals.
- Services which supplement and improve the quality of the educational services provided to such children and youth.
- Services which afford such children and youth an opportunity to meet the challenging Arizona Academic Achievement Standards.
- Facilitate the transition of children and youth from State-operated institutions to schools served by local educational agencies or facilitate the successful re-entry of youth offenders, who are age 20 or younger and have received a secondary school diploma or its recognized equivalent, into postsecondary education or vocational and technical training programs, through strategies designed to expose

the youth to and prepare the youth for post secondary education or vocational and technical training programs, such as:

- pre-placement programs that allow adjudicated or incarcerated youth to audit or attend courses on college, university, or community college campuses, or through programs provided in institutional settings;
- worksite schools, in which institutions of higher education and private or public employers partner to create programs to help students make a successful transition into postsecondary education and employment; and essential support services to ensure the success for youth ;
- personal, vocational, technical and academic counseling;
- placement services designed to place the youth in a university, college, or junior college program;
- information concerning and assistance in obtaining, available student financial aid; and
- counseling services and job placement services.

## **PERFORMANCE INDICATORS**

Arizona's students are assessed with two separate assessment instruments.

- 1) Arizona's Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS), which is a criterion referenced test aligned with the Arizona Academic Standards. The subject areas assessed are Mathematics, Reading, and Writing. Grades 3, 5, 8, and 10 are tested annually. Out-of-level testing is provided within the framework of a student's Individualized Education Plan (IEP). Performance data are disaggregated and reported annually to the ADE.
- 2) Stanford 9 is a norm-referenced test annually administered to grades 2-9. Subject areas measured are Reading, Mathematics and Language Arts.

Additional indicators will be developed and submitted to the USDE for approval.

Arizona is currently on a three-year monitoring cycle. This process requires an LEA to review and self-assess its existing program for program compliance and effectiveness. Subgrantees also must submit to the ADE completion reports for fiscal accountability as well as report on the effectiveness of their program in improving the academic, vocational and technical skills of students participating in the program. These tasks serve as preparation for the ADE monitoring team visit. During the monitoring process, LEAs are advised of their compliance status as well as any corrective actions which may be required.

## **PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVES**

The ADE supports LEAs in the operation of programs that:

- a. carry out high quality educational programs to prepare children and youth for secondary school completion, training, employment, or further education
- b. provide activities to facilitate the transition (particularly those who are likely to complete incarceration within two years) of such children and

- youth from the correctional program to further education or employment; and
- c. operate in local schools for children and youth returning from correctional facilities, and programs which may serve at-risk children and youth.

## **DATA SOURCES**

The ADE utilizes the following data sources in the operation of the program:

- Stanford 9 scores
- AIMS scores
- Completion and Comparability Reports
- Student counts
- The ADE On-site Review protocol document used in the monitoring process
- IASA Self-Assessment document

***4. b Describe how the SEA is assisting projects funded under the program in facilitating the transition of youth from correctional facilities to locally operated programs.***

The ADE provides ongoing assistance through financial support in the form of subgrants, technical assistance and on-site monitoring.

***4. c Describe how the funds reserved under section 1418 will be used for transition services for students leaving institutions for schools served by LEAs, or postsecondary institutions or vocational and technical training programs.***

Arizona contracts with LEAs, public agencies, or private non-profit organizations to provide transitional services to students leaving state operated institutions to attend schools served by LEAs. Services provided include:

- youth who have received secondary diplomas or GEDs are assisted in transitioning to postsecondary training programs or educational programs;
- students without high school diplomas are assisted in transitioning back into the comprehensive high school, vocational technical program, alternative secondary program or GED program;
- counseling services, financial aid, health and human services support in the form of food stamps eligibility, and transitional housing; and
- job placement and employment services.

## **5. Title I, Part F -- Comprehensive School Reform [Goals 1,2 5]**

***5. a Describe the process the State educational agency will use to ensure that programs funded include and integrate all eleven required components of a comprehensive school reform program.***

Comprehensive School Reform grants will be awarded based on how well the application integrates, and is aligned with all eleven required components of the

legislation. An initial technical review will be conducted to ensure that a minimum set of requirements is met. Each application passing a preliminary technical review will be scored three times by peer reviewers that have been given training on a specific rubric designed around the application. Once approved, each LEA applies for funds through the ADE's electronic grants management system. Budgets will be carefully reviewed to ensure that expenditures under each budget item align with the application that was submitted.

After receiving funding, ADE will perform a periodic review of the LEA/school's implementation of the Comprehensive School Reform Program. Periodic reviews will include, at a minimum, technical assistance by phone when requested by the LEA or school. In addition, site visits will be conducted annually along with the submission of a written Self-Assessment that will be submitted to ADE. The Self-Assessment, in combination with the annual site visit, provides all of the necessary information that ADE needs to determine whether the LEA/school is implementing a reform program that meets all eleven required components; and, therefore, will be eligible for second and third year funding.

***5. b Describe the process the State will use to determine the percentage of Comprehensive School Reform schools with increasing numbers of students meeting or exceeding the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading/language arts and mathematics.***

Following the accountability system established under AZ LEARNS (please refer to Part II, section 1.h.) the ADE will assess the proficiency of all students, including those attending CSR schools, in reading/language arts and mathematics using standards-based State assessments. The ADE will then disaggregate assessment data for CSR schools and conduct a longitudinal analysis to determine the percentage of CSR schools with increasing numbers of students meeting or exceeding the Proficient level of performance in the aforementioned academic content areas.

**6. Title II, Part A -- Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund [Goals 1,2,3,5]**

***6. a If not fully addressed in the State's response to the information on performance goals, indicators, and targets in Part I describe the remainder of the State's annual measurable objectives under section 1119(a)(2).***

The ADE has adopted the goals and corresponding indicators prescribed for submission of the Consolidated State Application on June 12, 2002, and will submit performance targets and baseline data related to these goals and indicators by the time of our May 2003 deadline. In light of the requirement that the SEA provide data in the annual performance report to indicate progress on the ESEA goals, as well as progress being made on any additional State goals and indicators being identified as overall benchmarks for improving student achievement, considerable attention must be paid to developing the plan that ensures all teachers teaching in core academic subjects are highly qualified not

later than the end of the 2005-2006 school year. As a result, no additional annual measurable objectives are being identified at this time for inclusion in the document.

***6. b Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable both for (1) meeting the annual measurable objectives described in section 1119(a)(2) of the ESEA, and (2) ensuring that the professional development the LEAs offer their teachers and other instructional staff is consistent with the definition of “professional development” in section 9101(34).***

The ADE will hold LEAs accountable for the annual measurable goals as described and adopted in their Local Consolidated Plans. LEAs are required to report annually, in thesecond year and beyond, their progress toward meeting approved performance targets. The ADE will evaluate each LEA’s progress and determine the level of technical assistance required whenever such targets are not met. In the event that an LEA fails to respond to recommendations being offered by the ADE and presents ample evidence of noncompliance, the LEA Consolidated Application (all ESEA Titles) shall be suspended and funds withheld until a new application and all programmatic data can be renegotiated.

The ADE will ensure that professional development activities funded under the approved LEA Consolidated Application are consistent with the definition provided under section 9101(34). Applications will contain “detailed” descriptions of each staff development activity; the curricula and how these are aligned to state standards and accountability systems; reasons, including the scientific basis, for their selection ; measurable impacts on student progress and achievement-gap reductions; integration of funding sources; and results of Needs Assessment.. The Annual Report will also offer ADE an opportunity to compare the professional development activities being funded each year with the results of the LEA’s formal Needs Assessment that were included in the LEA’s Consolidated Application when funds were released.

***6. c Describe the State Educational Agency and the State Agency for Higher Education’s agreement on the amount each will retain under section 2113(d) of ESEA. Section 2113(d) allows for one percent of the State’s program allocation for administration and planning costs.***

The former Eisenhower Professional Development Program permitted direct funding to a State Agency for Higher Education (SAHE) by reserving dollars from annual Title II allotments *prior* to granting monies to state educational agencies. With reauthorization of ESEA in the *NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT*, the ADE is being given responsibility for the allotment, in its entirety. Thus, in preparing the State Consolidated Application, key fiscal information must be included which explains the amounts of *new* Title II-A administrative dollars that will be allocated to the ADE and the SAHE, respectively. It is assumed that SAHE designation has been determined by the U.S. Department of Education as remaining with the Arizona Board of Regents (ABOR).

With passage of the *NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT*, the extent to which the ADE shall assume contractual oversight for the awarding of subgrant dollars requires clarification. During School Year 2001/02, funding awarded the SAHE from the U. S. Department of Education totaled \$1,150,319—of which no more than five (5) percent could be used for administrative costs. On April 4, 2002, staff contacted Mr. Tom Wickenden, Arizona Board of Regents Executive Director, who represents SAHE interests in future Title II-A funding. Mr. Wickenden informed the ADE that administrative charges totaling \$43,700 covered salaries, ERE, and the costs associated with the SAHE’s Request-for-Proposals (RFP) process. Such reporting points out, that of the permissible \$57,516 in administrative costs, only \$43,700 was required to administer the grant.

It is anticipated that an agreement between the SAHE and the ADE can be reached. Meetings between the ADE and Mr. Wickenden’s staff were scheduled in May 2002. At that time, both partners began establishment of the contractual framework, negotiated levels of administrative costs, specified ADE oversight of the RFP process, and agreed upon benchmarks for accountability and the effectiveness of subgrantees. As the various issues are resolved, an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) will be developed and presented for approval to the State Board of Education at its June meeting.

As further evidence that an agreement can be reached between these collaborative partners, the Arizona Board of Regents has suggested ways that its organization can benefit the Title II, Part A program in general. ABOR is willing to expand the scope of its RFP to incorporate key principles and goals. Included in the RFP would be a requirement that grantees present, as part of their evaluation plan, performance measures that assist ADE in determining how the state is meeting relevant performance measures. For example, for ESEA Goal #3 (all students will be taught by highly qualified teachers), a pertinent performance indicator appears to be 3.2 (the percentage of teachers receiving “high-quality” professional development). ABOR is convinced that numbers of educators served through one of its programs, taken together with data it accesses from other district programs, should provide a numerator that contributes to the overall state measure.

## **7. Title II, Part D -- Enhanced Education Through Technology [Goals 1,2,3]**

***7. a Describe the program goals, performance indicators, performance objectives, and data sources that the State has established for its use in assessing the effectiveness of the program in improving access to and use of educational technology by students and teachers in support of academic achievement.***

From Arizona’s State Technology Plan, pgs. 16 to 19 <http://www.ade.az.gov/technology>

**Goal 1:** Improve student academic achievement through the use of technology in elementary and secondary schools with a target of fully integrating technology into the academic curriculum by December 2006. (took our Goal 1 from the AZ Tech Plan)

<b>Objective</b>	<b>Strategy</b>	<b>Accountability Measure</b>
<b>1.1</b> Ensure that all students have educational opportunities to achieve academic success (including constant and consistent improvement) through the use of proven strategies of teaching and learning (research-based successful practices).	<b>1.1.1</b> Develop dissemination channels for reaching all K-12 personnel with the latest in teaching/learning strategies supported by research-based instructional methods and practices. (Best Practices).	<b>1.1.1.1</b> Number of current and continuing dissemination channels. Number of web-based and collegial sharing techniques of research-based practices.
	<b>1.1.2</b> Continue to review, revise and refine the Arizona Academic Standards through annual or biennial academic reviews of the standards, including analysis and recommendations for Accountability Measures.	<b>1.1.2.1</b> Completion of Technology Standards revision by December 2003.  <b>1.1.2.2</b> Technology Standards for Students are brought to the State Board of Education to reflect the changes in the field and the progress in implementation and curricular integration.
	<b>1.1.3</b> Convene a statewide taskforce to develop a systematic document or device to demonstrate integration of technology skills and objectives with other academic standards of achievement.	<b>1.1.3.1</b> Completion of a concrete document or device that is shared within the state including the target date of December 2006.
	<b>1.1.4</b> Provide encouragement and training to promote LEA development of web-based learning for K-12 personnel.	<b>1.1.4.1</b> Number of the documents or devises.  <b>1.1.4.2</b> Number of accesses by personnel and students to web-based learning acknowledged by the state.

	<b>1.1.5</b> Fund training in the use of Internet-based data disaggregation tools for schools, district, and state education agencies.	<b>1.1.5.1</b> Number of trainings given.
	<b>1.1.6</b> Ensure that “failing” schools or those with highest number or percentages of children in poverty receive assistance in applying for technology resources to support increased student achievement.	<b>1.1.6.1</b> Number of schools with highest percentages of children in poverty or designated as “failing” under Title 1* that received support in writing plans and getting funding.
	<b>1.1.7</b> Promote use of distance learning to increase opportunities for students to improve achievement, through traditional settings and at-home or alternative locations.	<b>1.1.7.1</b> Amount of increase in requested funding for distance learning  <b>1.1.7.2</b> Increase in number of academic credits granted.
	<b>1.1.8</b> Develop policy and procedure to support funding for student use of distance learning in a K-12 environment.	<b>1.1.8.1</b> Increase in amount of funding provided for distance learning credits for students (virtual environments).
<b>1.2</b> Ensure that each Arizona school has a plan for meeting the Technology Education Standards of the Arizona Academic Standards.	<b>1.2.1</b> Provide all LEA’s with access to quality resources, support systems and training to support the Technology Education Standards.	<b>1.2.1</b> Number of District level Governing Boards that approve Technology Plans (or revisions less than 2 years old) and that adopt the Technology Education Standards and place curricular emphasis on their inclusion during instructional time.  <b>1.2.2</b> Number of school-level Technology Plans that support the District’s objectives but may have even more local nuances.

---

\* Under AZ LEARNS, schools will be identified as failing under a comprehensive state accountability system.



	1.2.2 Ensure that failing schools or those with highest numbers of percentages of children in poverty get assistance in writing thoughtful and productive technology plans.	1.2.2.1 Number of schools with highest percentages of children in poverty or designated as “failing” under Title 1 that receive individual support in writing plans.
1.3 Encourage LEAs to utilize innovative practices that will lead to increased student achievement, especially supporting the early reading initiative	1.3.1 Provide incentives (bonus points) for LEAs inside and outside the formula system to use the competitive grant application process to try new approaches in schools with low achievement.	1.3.1.1 Increase in rubric scores of grant applications that provide points for innovation related to reading achievement.
	1.3.2 Determine a minimum funding pattern to be supportive of quality innovation including the need to share and disseminate plans and results in a timely manner.	1.3.2.1 The per teacher cost of the most recently funded competitive grants deemed successful (ADE will calculate and apply as a formula for minimum funding in competitive applications.)

**7. b Provide a brief summary of the SEA’s long-term strategies for improving student academic achievement, including technology literacy, through the effective use of technology in the classroom, and the capacity of teachers to integrate technology effectively into curricula and instruction.**

From Arizona’s State Technology Plan, pgs. 16 to 19. <http://www.ade.az.gov/technology>

**Goal 2:** Ensure that high quality teachers, staff and administrators are involved in Arizona educational institutions and that they are proficient in the use and integration of technology through professional development activities.

**7. c Describe key activities that the SEA will conduct or sponsor with the funds it retains at the State level.**

Several LEAs wrote projects to include distance learning as part of the competitive grant applications. Results of that competition will not be available for several more weeks. Arizona has an ASP (Application Service Provider), which provides more than 250 software titles that our LEAs were able to include in their technology planning both for formula and competitive grants. The ASP is free to educators and students 24-hours per day; and training is free through Arizona State System of Educational Technology (ASSET).

Arizona will utilize 60% of the administrative funds we retain for integrating our electronic student level data program and expanding it to include achievement data. We have also developed and customized a program which allows the manipulation of reported data to obtain reports at the local level for educators, staff, and parents. Funds will be used to expand and align both of these programs.

**7. d Provide a brief description of how –**

***The SEA will ensure that students and teachers, particularly those in the schools of high-need LEAs, have increased access to technology,***

Increased accessibility to technology for students and teachers in high-need LEAs is ensured in Arizona by several methods. The Arizona School Facilities Board has been mandated to assure a student to computer ratio of 8:1 in all school districts in Arizona. (This does not include charter schools; however, under prior TLCF funding competitions, many Arizona charter schools received funding that allowed them to purchase multi-media computers of comparable quality to those provided to school districts. Because they had to compete with district schools with student to computer ratios of 8:1, many charter schools developed other methods of funding a comparable ratio.) At this point, most schools in Arizona have achieved the desired 8:1 ratio, and, in many cases have surpassed that.

As stated in Part II, 2, b, a rigorous set of expectations and requirements was placed on LEAs applying for discretionary Ed Tech funding. LEAs were asked to address technology access issues and meet certain benchmarks with their proposed project. Application reviewers were well versed in the standards set by Arizona and applicants were strictly high-need LEAs.

***The SEA will coordinate the application and award process for State discretionary grant and formula grant funds under this program.***

The ADE Technology Director supervises state coordination of the Ed Tech competitive subgrant application and award process. The program office assures that a high-quality, well-planned funding process and an accountability system is in place for LEAs receiving funding under Ed Tech.

The same program office also coordinates the Arizona Ed Tech formula funding process for Arizona. The Title I formula will be obtained from that state office to assist with the formula fund distribution. The details of the formula program are discussed in Part II, Question 6.

The means for reporting the disposition of Ed Tech funds will be provided by the Grants Management System. In addition, programmatic accountability for LEA's use of the Ed Tech funds will be coordinated by the State Technology Director and will consist of annual reporting/dissemination strategies, along with technical support and assistance from the RTCs and federal program monitoring activities.

## **8. Title III, Part A -- English Language Acquisition and Language Enhancement [Goals 1,2,3,5]**

***8. a Describe how the SEA will ensure that LEAs use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of limited English proficient children while allowing LEAs flexibility (to the extent permitted under State law) to select and implement such activities in a manner that the grantees determine best reflects local needs and circumstances.***

Arizona will ensure that subgrantees use program funds only to carry out activities that reflect scientifically based research on the education of English language learners (ELLs) while allowing LEAs flexibility to implement such activities in a manner that grantees determine best reflects their local needs and circumstances by promoting the following activities:

- ESEA Section 9101(37)(B)(i) research that employs systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experimentation – LEAs will be encouraged to use this method to help them evaluate their ELL programs and determine if the program as implemented is helping ELLs reach English proficiency and meet Arizona Academic Standards.
- ESEA Section 9101(37)(B)(ii) involves rigorous data analyses that are adequate to test the stated hypotheses and justify the general conclusions drawn. In 2002, for the first time, ELLs in Arizona were not exempted from annual academic assessment. The Arizona Instrument to Measure Standards (AIMS) and the Stanford 9 test were given to all students. LEAs will be encouraged to use these data to evaluate ELL programs and make necessary changes according to findings based on the hypothesis stated in their research.
- ESEA Section 9101 (37)(B)(iii) relies on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and valid data across evaluators and observers, across multiple measurements and observations, and across studies by the same or different investigators—ADE will train all English Acquisition Services staff on best practices and evaluation of English learner programs, using the LEAs' English programs Self-Assessment instruments, EAS monitoring protocol, and the EAS school site visit protocol (includes classroom observation, curriculum review, faculty interviews, and student records review).

***8. b Describe how the SEA will hold LEAs accountable for meeting all annual measurable achievement objectives for limited English proficient children, and making adequate yearly progress that raises the achievement of limited English proficient children.***

The Flores Consent Order, signed in June 2000, and House Bill 2010, signed December 2002, require the ADE to establish standards to help ELLs reach English proficiency and meet the Arizona Academic Standards. The ELL program standards have been identified. These standards: **English language assessment** (initial assessment, re-assessment for reclassification, and evaluation of Fluent English Proficient (FEP) students for two years); **Native language assessment** for ELLs in bilingual programs; **ELL programs** (Structured English Immersion and Bilingual Programs); **Qualification of personnel**; **ELL instructional materials**; and **ELL Compensatory Education** will determine the goals and objectives that will be developed to help ELLs reach English proficiency and meet the Arizona Academic Standards.

By the end of the 2002-2003 school year, the goals and objectives in the domains of speaking, listening, reading, writing, and comprehension in English will be developed for our ELLs. These will be aligned with the Arizona academic content core classes and Arizona Academic Standards. Our goal is to help ELLs learn to listen to, speak, read, write, and comprehend English at the same time that they are mastering and achieving cognitive and academic skills.

The ADE will hold all LEAs accountable for all annual measurable achievement objectives set to meet these standards. Every year, 32 different LEAs will be monitored to assure that LEAs are meeting ELL goals and are accountable for their program objectives. A one-year follow-up will be conducted for LEAs that were monitored and found not to be meeting established objectives.

***8. c Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve and the percentage of the reserved funds that the State will use for each of the following categories of State-level activities***

State-level activities will be funded as follows:

- 1% professional development
- 3% planning, evaluation, administration, and interagency coordination
- 1% technical assistance
- 0% providing recognition to subgrantees

***8. d Specify the percentage of the State's allotment that the State will reserve for subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.***

The state will reserve 15% for immigrant children and youth to provide subgrants to LEAs that have reported a significant increase in their immigrant student population.

***8. e Describe the process that the State will use in making subgrants under section 3114(d) to LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth.***

LEAs that have experienced a significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant children and youth in their districts will be eligible to receive these funds. The ADE will take into consideration the experience that the LEAs have had serving immigrant children and youth, the quality of the local plan to serve immigrant children and youth, and the subgrantee's sufficient size and scope to meet the purposes of Title III.

***8. f Specify the number of limited English proficient children in the State***

135,503 ELLs were reported in the Survey of Arizona's LEP students.

***8. g Provide the most recent data available on the number of immigrant children and youth in the State.***

31,503 immigrant children and youth were reported in the Survey of Arizona's LEP students.

**9. Title IV, Part A -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities**  
**[Goal 4]**

***9. a Describe the key strategies in the State's comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the SEA and the Governor to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that –***

- ***Complement and support activities of LEAs under section 4115(b) of the ESEA;***
- ***Comply with the principles of effectiveness under section 4115(a); and***
- ***Otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of Title IV, Part A.***

Key strategies in Arizona's comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the ADE and the Governor to provide safe, orderly and drug-free schools and communities include:

- Collaboration and Coordination Between the ADE and the Governor's Community Policy Office (GCPO) - All programs funded through the Governor's portion of Title IV are required to demonstrate a linkage with LEA prevention programs. These community-based programs are designed to reach youth that are not normally served by the ADE and cannot duplicate the services provided in the school. In order to ensure this collaboration between LEAs and community-based programs, the Governor's Office staff and the ADE staff will conduct joint monitoring visits and offer collaborative training and technical assistance for grantees.

- Collaboration and Coordination Between The GCPA and ADE—Prevention efforts have been coordinated with other state agencies including the Arizona Department of Health Services, the Department of Economic Security, the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections, Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission, the Administrative Office of the Courts, and the Attorney General’s Office. One example of this coordination is the development of the Arizona Program Design and Evaluation Logic Model. The Logic Model was developed for the purpose of creating a standardized, consistent approach for solicitation, application, and award of grants. GCPO, the ADE and the other agencies named above utilize the Logic Model in their Request For Grant Application (RFGA) processes.
- Technical Assistance, Training and Oversight – The primary strategy for use of Title IV funds is the LEA programs. Therefore, significant time is spent on technical assistance, training and oversight. The application process for LEAs requires that the Principles of Effectiveness be followed in the program design. Progress required on performance measures is stated in the application and status is reported on the year-end report. On-site monitoring of a sample of LEAs is conducted to ensure implementation of the program as planned and appropriate use of funds. Training is offered throughout the year that addresses the Principles and highlights effective strategies.
- Protective Schools Project – The protective schools concept, developed by the College of Education at the University of Arizona, is research-based and relies on these underlying assumptions: that considerable overlap exists among the risk factors that predispose youth to substance abuse, violence, teen pregnancy, and school failure; that effective interventions for substance abuse, violence, school failure and teen pregnancy share many common features; and that effective prevention strategies are consistent with best practices in education. The purpose of this project is to work with under-performing schools by providing training on the protective schools concept and technical assistance to targeted subgroups.
- Arizona Behavioral Initiative (ABI) – ABI was developed to improve school safety and is a collaborative effort between the ADE, Arizona State University, University of Arizona, and Northern Arizona University. The purpose is to establish a comprehensive and focused statewide effort to improve the capacity of educators, administrators and education professionals to address their specific school discipline needs and facilitate the development of positive teaching and learning environments. The ABI is grounded in research on successful school change and School-Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (SWPBIS). Through ABI, schools are provided with technical assistance and training.

- Academic Standards – The State Board of Education adopted standards for Comprehensive Health Education in 1997. The content areas of these standards include violence and substance prevention. Training and technical assistance is provided to schools in the following areas: correlation between standards-based education and effective prevention programming, assessment development, and adaptation of instructional practices based on student assessment scores. Training and technical assistance will be expanded to include infusion of health concepts into other subjects for which Arizona has adopted standards.
- School Safety Plan Development - Technical assistance and training are provided to schools on the development of safety plans and responses in emergency situations. Multi-Hazard Safety Training for schools is offered in partnership with Arizona Department of Emergency and Military Affairs Division of Emergency Management. Development of a new course, Incident Command System for Schools, is in process. Technical assistance is provided in coordination with county emergency management offices.

***9. b Describe the State's performance measures for drug and violence prevention programs and activities to be funded under Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1.***

Arizona will use the following performance measures for drug abuse and violence prevention programs and activities:

- The percentage of students who carried a weapon on school property
- The percentage of students who engaged in physical fights on school property
- The percentage of students offered, sold, or given an illegal drug on school property
- The number of persistently dangerous schools (definition to be determined)

The performance measures were selected based upon review of the Arizona School Safety Study (see 9. c below) and LEA program objectives. The data collection method for the performance measures is also described in 9. c. below. Targets and specific indicators will be developed in school year 2002-2003 and will be included in next year's Arizona Consolidated Application.

***9. c Describe the steps the State will use to implement the Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS) required by section 4112(c)(3). The description should include information about which agency(ies) will be responsible for implementing the UMIRS, a tentative schedule for implementing the UMIRS requirements, as well as preliminary plans for collecting required information.***

The ADE has already begun the process of implementing a Uniform Management Information and Reporting System (UMIRS). Arizona's UMIRS is called the Comprehensive Health Education Standards Surveillance Systems (CHESSS). This UMIRS will provide a coordinated system of data collection regarding the role of prevention, health and safety in learning and academic achievement. The intent is to reduce the amount of reports required from every school each year, while increasing the

use of sample-based and confidential research design. The ADE takes primary responsibility for ensuring the implementation of the UMIRS. The design of individual components of the UMIRS will be done in collaboration with other state agencies and the Governors Office. The ADE is currently getting input from schools on the availability and definitions of data under 4112 (c)(3)(B)(i) truancy rates (Safe and Drug Free Schools Report) and questions are being piloted for 4112 (c)(3)(B)(ii) the frequency, incidence and seriousness of violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions for each school (Arizona School Safety Study).

Anonymous student surveys, such as the Youth Risk Behavior Survey (YRBS), will be used to provide data for 4112 (c)(3)(B)(iv), the incidence and prevalence, age of onset, perception of health risk, and perception of social disapproval of drug use and violence by youth. Confidential teacher surveys may also be employed as needed (Arizona School Health Education Profile (SHEP), Arizona School Safety Study (SSS)). The YRBS, SHEP and SSS use random-sampling and provide state-level data. Finally, 4112 (c)(3)(B)(iii), types of curricula, programs, and services provided by grantees though the use of grantee annual reports (Safe and Drug-Free Schools Report) and a random-sample-based teachers and principals survey (School Health Education Profile).

#### Schedule for Implementation of the CHESSS/UMIRS:

##### School Year 2002 - 2003

The Safe and Drug Free Schools Report, which collects school data for the ESEA Consolidated Report, added optional questions about school-level collection of truancy rates. This report is due to the ADE on June 30, 2002, and is online. The Arizona School Safety Study, based on the National Center for Education Statistics School Survey on Crime and Safety, includes questions that are being tested for use in gathering violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsions. The Arizona School Safety Study is conducted annually.

The School Health Education Profile (US Centers for Disease Prevention and Control) surveys health education and principals at a sample of schools with students in grades 6 through 12. Included in the School Health Education Profile are questions about alcohol, drug, tobacco and violence prevention education offered, teacher training and school policy and procedures for violence prevention, tobacco prevention and discipline. The 2004 School Health Education Profile will be designed to include Arizona-specific issues and covers grades K-12.

##### School Year 2003 - 2004

By September or October of 2002, ADE hopes to share with schools the new questions for the Safe and Drug-Free Schools Reports based on Arizona School Safety Study experience with the questions on violence and drug-related offenses resulting in suspensions and expulsion contained in the 2002 study. The Youth Risk Behavior Survey will be used to gather baseline data on fights on school grounds, use or sale of drugs on school grounds and weapons on school grounds. The intent is to have the survey in schools to be sampled by January or February 2004.



	SY 2002 Data Collection – Pilot	SY 2003 Data Collection - Baseline	SY 2004 Data Collection
All Schools/Grantees	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Report	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Report	Safe and Drug-Free Schools Report
Sample of Schools (school personnel)	School Health Education Profiles	Possible Study for ESEA, if needed	Arizona School Health Education Profiles
Sample of School (students)		Youth Risk Behavior Survey	
Sample of Schools (school administration)	Arizona School Safety Study	Arizona School Safety Study	Arizona School Safety Study

The Governor’s Community Policy Office supports the Arizona Department of Education’s UMIRS. Community-based programs will be required to partner with local LEAs to ensure participation in the ADE plan. Comprehensive program evaluation specific to the Governor’s programs will also be conducted.

**10. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 1, section 4112(a) -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Reservation of State Funds for the Governor [Goal 4]**

***10. a The Governor may reserve up to 20 percent of the State’s allocation under this program to award competitive grants or contracts. Indicate the percentage of the State’s allocation that is to be reserved for the Governor’s program.***

Twenty percent (20%) will be reserved for the Governor

***10. b The Governor may administer these funds directly or designate an appropriate State agency to receive the funds and administer this allocation. Provide the name of the entity designated to receive these funds, contact information for that entity (the name of the head of the designated agency, address, telephone number) and the “DUNS” number that should be used to award these funds.***

Program Administrator:  
 Lyra McCoy  
 Governor’s Division of Drug Policy  
 1700 W. Washington Suite 101  
 Phoenix, AZ 85007  
 phone (602)542-6005, fax (602)542-3643  
[lmccoy@az.gov](mailto:lmccoy@az.gov)

Governor: Jane Dee Hull

DUNS number: 072459266

## **11. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 2, section 4126 -- Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities: Community Service Grants [Goal 4]**

*11. a. Describe how the SEA, after it has consulted with the Governor, will use program funds to develop and implement a community service program for suspended and expelled students.*

Arizona law (ARS 15-841 I.) requires that schools establish alternatives to suspension programs for students that are disruptive, violent or potentially violent, and the program may include community service. This law became effective January 2001. Presently, there is no data available on the extent to which this law is implemented and there is no enforcement provided by the law. Additionally, available data on suspension/expulsion rates is incomplete (pieces of data are available for Gun-Free Schools Act (GFSA), Exceptional Student Services (ESS) and others). It is known, though, that Arizona is among the highest in the nation for dropout rate. For all grades, 5.8% of dropouts were expelled students that never returned to school; for elementary grades, 15.9% of dropouts were expelled students that never returned.

The ADE, in consultation with the Governor's Community Policy Office, intends to utilize this grant funding for the following activities:

- Identify existing practices for suspensions/expulsions in Arizona schools;
- Research Best Practices for community service programs in the literature;
- Document Best Practices in Arizona; and
- Develop tools for evaluating community service programs.

## **12. Title IV, Part B: 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers [Goals 1, 2, and 5]**

*Identify the percentage of students participating in 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers who meet or exceed the proficient level of performance on State assessments in reading and mathematics.*

The percentage of students who participate in the 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers program will be tracked to determine their level of performance on the State Assessment (AIMS) in grades 3, 5, 8 and 9-12. Grantees will provide data on each student to determine if they meet or exceed the Proficient level of performance. Should this data be available through our Student Accountability Information System (SAIS), the ADE will obtain it directly. Achievement profiles on all low performing school wide programs will also be available and posted on the Web. The website is [www.ade.az.gov/programs/TitleIVB](http://www.ade.az.gov/programs/TitleIVB).

### **13. Title V, Part A -- Innovative Programs [Any goal(s) selected by State]**

***13. a In accordance with section 5112(a)(1) of the ESEA, provide the SEA's formula for distributing program funds to LEAs. Include information on how the SEA will adjust its formula to provide higher per-pupil allocations to LEAs that have the greatest numbers or percentages of children whose education imposes a higher-than-average cost per child,***

Pending U.S. Department of Education approval, the ADE recommends Title V, Part A funds be allocated to LEAs under a formula which is nearly identical to that currently being used. The weight, however, under has been revised to reflect a corresponding change from "Free & Reduced-Price Lunch Program" eligibility data to "Free Lunch Program" eligibility data, which are preferred due to ever increasing reliability system-wide, especially in terms of those data being collected and reported by the many charter schools in Arizona. In addition, the student count has been set at 750 pupils in an attempt to adequately address the criterion, "Children living in sparsely populated areas," and continue to include those local educational agencies that are truly rural and/or isolated—in spite of increases in population being experienced throughout the state. The formula being proposed adheres to the law in both the per-pupil formula and adjustments required for high-cost populations.

**Enrollment Counts** – includes Public and Private School students.

#### **High Cost Populations:**

- ***Children living in areas with concentrations of economically disadvantaged families;***

LEAs shall be awarded the additional .10 weight based on at least 49 percent of their students having qualified for the Free Lunch Program.

- ***Children from economically disadvantaged families***

LEAs shall be awarded the additional .05 weight based on student Title I Eligibility.

- ***Children living in sparsely populated areas.***

LEAs shall be awarded the additional .25 weight based on enrollment counts for districts and charter schools with less than 750 students. A unified district with K–8 enrollments or 9–12 enrollments that are less than 750 students shall also qualify for this additional funding increment for one, or both, enrollment counts that meet this criterion.

**13. b) Identify the amount or percentage the State will reserve for each State-level activity under section 5121, and describe the activity.**

Historically, the ADE uses its administrative dollars to inform local educational agencies that private nonprofit schools operating within the established boundaries of the LEA must be contacted to obtain student enrollment data. These data are collected and reported annually to the ADE. The ADE On-site Monitoring Protocol requires systematic inquiry of LEAs representing private nonprofit schools operating within their boundaries in terms of notification, outreach, assurance of equitable participation, and inclusion in open-session staff development opportunities. Approximately \$11,250 is reserved from state set-aside funds each year to comply with the provisions of Section 5121.

Prior to enactment of State Charter School statutes, the ADE performed outreach to the Private Schools Association, representing the vast majority of administrators and school principals of these private nonprofit schools. Following Charter School legislation, many of the former private nonprofit schools have been chartered in Arizona as public educational agencies, given identical status as their former respondent public school districts. As a result of such substantial change, the monies which are reserved from state set-aside funds are now expended under the auspices of outreach, dissemination activities (especially, as this applies to Arizona's Academic Standards), and staff development services being delivered to private nonprofit schools by the RURAL COUNTIES CONSORTIUM. Prior to the implementation of the *NO CHILD LEFT BEHIND ACT*, the ADE will establish a working relationship with its emerging REGIONAL SUPPORT CENTERS. Section 5121 reserves will be expended with as many of the proposed fourteen (14) Offices of County School Superintendents as can demonstrate evidence of greatest need. Such a change in ADE policy should be viewed as minimal in terms of its implementation.

In the response to Part II, State Activities to Implement ESEA Programs, Question 3. the Academic Support Division describes how the state will monitor and provide professional development and technical assistance to LEAs, schools, and other subgrantees to help them implement their programs and meet the State's (and those entities' own) performance goals and objectives. That response adequately addresses the dollars allocated LEAs under Title V, Part A. Because compliance monitoring and the state's delivery of technical assistance occurs in a cross-programmatic fashion for programs consolidated at the local level, procedures developed for Title I-A and Title II-A apply equally to Title V-A, especially with regard to identifying and implementing effective instructional programs and practices based on scientific research.

Section 5112(b) permits States to use 15 % of their total allocation for State-level activities. **Fifteen (15)** percent of the Title V–A Grant is reserved for State Uses of Funds, of which *not more than 15 percent* is to be expended for state administration of the program. For School Year 2001-2002 the State Set-Aside is **\$864,711**. Under State Programs, the following is a listing of anticipated Technical Assistance activities and awards of grants to LEAs. School Year 2000-2002 allocations are included for purposes of estimating dollar impact as a portion of total.

- State Awards to Rural Counties Consortium: \$307,800
- Constituent Services: \$63,477
- Research & Policy: \$83,612
- Academic Standards & Accountability: \$211,718
- Instructional Support: \$96,374

The State may use 15 percent of the 15 percent reserved for State use for administration. Only **Fifteen (15)** percent of the 15-percent share of the state allotment is available next fiscal year for state program administration. That amount will not exceed **\$152,596** which represents a sizable decrease in administrative dollars when compared to the current ceiling set for program administration at \$254,326.

#### **14. Title VI, Part A, Subpart 1, Section 6111 – State Assessments**

**Formula Grants [Goals 1,2,3,5]** *Describe how the State plans to use formula funds awarded under section 6113(b)(1) for the development and implementation of State assessments in accordance with section 6111(1) and (2).*

Please refer to Part III.1.e

#### **15. Title VI, Part B, Subpart 2 -- Rural and Low-Income School Program [Goals 1,2,3,5]**

***15. a Identify the SEA's specific measurable goals and objectives related to increasing student academic achievement; decreasing student dropout rates; or improvement in other educational factors the SEA may elect to measure, and describe how Rural and Low-Income School program funds will help the SEA meet the goals and objectives identified.***

Through the Rural and Low-Income School Program, the ADE will provide additional support to a group of LEAs that receive formula grant allocations too small to be effective in meeting intended program purposes, including reaching the goals adopted by the ADE under ESEA. The ADE has identified that all Goals, 1 through 5, as listed in Part I - ESEA Goals, ESEA Indicators and State Performance Targets, apply to the Rural and Low-Income School Program. Participants in the Rural and Low-Income School Program will use these funds to supplement efforts to improve student achievement and the quality of teachers and other instructional staff. When combined with other rural education achievement initiatives, the Rural and Low-Income School Program will enable these LEAs to contribute to Arizona's meeting its performance targets.

**15. b Describe how the State elects to make awards under the Rural and Low-Income School Program:**

The ADE has identified 34 LEAs in 11 of its 15 counties as eligible to apply for the Rural and Low-Income School Program. The ADE will make allocations from its state award, minus the allowable administrative set-aside, based on each LEA's share of the total number of students (51,968) served by these LEAs. For the initial year, each LEA will submit an electronic application that includes a budget and budget description plus responses to questions about use of funds, achievement data, and the goals and indicators identified in Part I. In subsequent years, LEAs will report progress toward the goals and indicators in their applications for additional funding. After an LEA has participated for three years, the ADE will determine continuation of funding based upon whether the LEA has met adequate yearly progress, as defined by AZ LEARNS, and progress toward its identified goals.

The application will require the LEA to establish the need to use the funds in one or more of the authorized programs. The LEA will identify the program that the additional Rural Low-Income School Program funds will support and the applicable goals that it intends to meet. The LEA may choose to write additional goals and report progress in meeting those goals as well. If the LEA chooses to apply funds to a program that has no state-level goal, the LEA must write a local goal to be used to evaluate the effect of the Rural and Low-Income funds.

Additionally, the LEA must have filed its Declaration of Curricular and Instructional Alignment to the Arizona Academic Standards with the ADE, provide an assurance that the LEA will participate in the state's assessment system, and agree to submit an annual report of the use of Rural and Low-Income School Program funds and progress toward the identified goals.

## **GEPA (General Education Provisions Act), Section 427**

In compliance with the General Education Provisions Act (GEPA), Section 427 the ADE has developed the following steps that will be taken to ensure equitable access to, and participation in, federally assisted programs for students, teachers, and other program beneficiaries.

- **Coordinate a process of cooperation and collaboration** between and among our public education systems, such as private schools, federally funded schools, and institutions of higher education, including tribal colleges, to ensure equitable access and participation of recipients of NCLB programs
- **Address key policy and program issues** that create barriers to improved academic achievement of all students. To meet the needs of all students, these areas may include: admissions criteria, financial aid, assessment, teacher preparation (serving the needs of English Language Learners, students with disabilities, and migrant students), academic transitions and curriculum alignment.
- **Encourage strategic partnership-building** focused on teacher training and curriculum development, which supports equity in all learning activities described in the NCLB Application.

- **Ensure compliance at LEA level** through statutes and State Board Rules. The ADE and the State Board of Education have demonstrated outstanding leadership in institutionalizing equitable access and participation for all students. Under Mission and Philosophy, the following excerpts reflect the Board's commitment to supporting student diversity:  
 "the opportunity for an appropriate quality education is the right of every student in Arizona, regardless of sex, ethnic or religious heritage, handicapping condition, geographic" or economic circumstance  
  
 "Arizona's multicultural heritage requires an educational system which serves the needs and preserves the values and dignity of all members of our society."

## **Consolidated Administrative Funds**

### ***1. Does the SEA plan to consolidate State-level administrative funds?***

***If yes, please provide information and analysis concerning Federal and other funding that demonstrates that Federal funds constitute less than half of the funds used to support the SEA.***

In accordance with SEC. 9201. CONSOLIDATION OF STATE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDS FOR ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION PROGRAMS, the Arizona Department of Education intends to consolidate State-level administrative funds. Our current analysis indicates that the total amount of administrative funds available will be less than \$3,900,000, for the state fiscal year ending June 30, 2003. The estimated non-federal contribution will be in excess of \$6,500,000.

The non-federal share was determined by reviewing **Attachment 3 (See Appendix)**, the Proposed Arizona Department of Education Budget for the Year Ending June 30, 2003. According to the information presented the total operating budget of the Arizona Department of Education, exclusive of Federal funds, is at least \$6,500,000.

***If yes, are there any programs whose funds are available for administration that the SEA will not consolidate?***

No. The Arizona Department of Education will consolidate all available funds.

***Please describe your plans for any additional uses of funds.*** Not applicable

### **Transferability**

***Does the State plan to transfer non-administrative State-level ESEA funds under the provisions of the State and Local Transferability Act (sections 6121 to 6123 of the ESEA)?***

No

## ASSURANCES AND CERTIFICATIONS

### Instructions:

The Consolidated State Application Signature Page, signed by the authorized State/SEA representative and **submitted in June 2002**, certifies the State's agreement to the following sets of assurances, the crosscutting certification, and the requirements of GEPA, Section 427.

### General and Cross-Cutting Assurances

*Description:* Section 9304(a) requires States to have on file with the Secretary a single set of assurances, applicable to each program included in the consolidated application, that provide that --

1. Each such program will be administered in accordance with all applicable statutes, regulations, program plans, and applications;
2. The control of funds provided under each such program and title to property acquired with program funds will be in a public agency, a nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or an Indian tribe, if the law authorizing the program provides for assistance to those entities; and
3. The public agency, nonprofit private agency, institution, or organization, or Indian tribe will administer those funds and property to the extent required by the authorizing law;
4. The State will adopt and use proper methods of administering each such program, including—
  - a. The enforcement of any obligations imposed by law on agencies, institutions, organizations, and other recipients responsible for carrying out each program;
  - b. The correction of deficiencies in program operations that are identified through audits, monitoring, or evaluation; and
  - c. The adoption of written procedures for the receipt and resolution of complaints alleging violations of law in the administration of the programs;
5. The State will cooperate in carrying out any evaluation of each such program conducted by or for the Secretary or other Federal officials;
6. The State will use such fiscal control and fund accounting procedures as will ensure proper disbursement of, and accounting for, Federal funds paid to the State under each such program;
7. The State will—
  - a. Make reports to the Secretary as may be necessary to enable the Secretary to perform the Secretary's duties under each such program; and
  - b. Maintain such records, provide such information to the Secretary, and afford such access to the records as the Secretary may find necessary to carry out the Secretary's duties; and
  - c. Before the plan or application was submitted to the Secretary, the State afforded a reasonable opportunity for public comment on the plan or application and considered such comment.



## **Certification**

### Certification of compliance with Unsafe School Choice Option Requirements

The State certifies that it has established and implemented a statewide policy requiring that students attending persistently dangerous public elementary or secondary schools, as determined by the State (in consultation with a representative sample of local educational agencies), or who become victims of violent criminal offenses, as determined by State law, while in or on the grounds of public elementary and secondary schools that the students attend, be allowed to attend safe public elementary or secondary schools within the local educational agency, including a public charter school.

## **ESEA Program Specific Assurances**

Each SEA that submits a consolidated application also must provide an assurance that it will comply with all requirements of the ESEA programs included in their consolidated applications, whether or not the program statute identifies these requirements as a description or assurance that States would address, absent this consolidated application, in a program-specific plan or application. States are required to maintain records of their compliance with each of those requirements. (Note: For the Safe and Drug Free Schools programs, the SEA must have all appropriate assurances from the Governor on record.)

Through the general assurance and assurance (1) in section 9304 (a), the SEA agrees to comply with all requirements of the ESEA and other applicable program statutes. While all requirements are important, we have identified below a number of key requirements of each program that the SEA is agreeing to meet through this general assurance. This list of program-specific requirements the SEA is assuring is not exhaustive; States are accountable for all program requirements.

### 1. Title I, Part A – Improving Basic Programs Operated By LEAs

Assurance that –

- a. The State plan for the implementation of Title I, Part A was developed in consultation with LEAs, teachers, principals, pupil services personnel, administrators, other staff and parents and that the plan for Title I, Part A coordinates with other programs under this Act, the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, the Carl D. Perkins Vocational and Technical Education Act of 1998, the Head Start Act, the Adult Education and Family Literacy Act, and the McKinney-Vento Homeless Assistance Act.
- b. The SEA has a plan for assisting LEAs and schools to develop capacity to comply with program operation and for providing additional educational assistance to students needing help to achieve State standards, including:
  - i. the use of schoolwide programs;
  - ii. steps to ensure that both schoolwide program- and targeted assisted program schools have highly qualified staff (section 1111);
  - iii. ensuring that assessments results are used by LEAs, schools, and teachers to improve achievement (section 1111);
  - iv. use of curricula aligned with state standards (section 1111);

- v. provision of supplemental services, including a list of approved service providers and standards and techniques for monitoring the quality and effectiveness of services (section 1116);
- vi. choice and options (section 1116);
- vii. the state support system under section 1117; and
- viii. teacher and paraprofessional qualifications (section 1119).
- c. The State has a strategy for ensuring that children served by Title I, Part A will be taught the same knowledge and skills in other subjects and held to the same expectations as all children.
- d. The State will implement the accountability requirements of section 1116(f) regarding schools identified for improvement prior to the passage of NCLB.
- e. The State will implement the provisions of section 1116 regarding LEAs and schools in improvement and corrective action.
- f. The State will produce and disseminate an annual State Report Card in accordance with section 1111(h)(1) and will ensure that LEAs that receive Title I, Part A funds produce and disseminate annual local Report Cards in accordance with section 1111(h)(2).
- g. The SEA will ensure that LEAs will annually assess English skills for all limited-English proficient students.
- h. The SEA will coordinate with other agencies that provide services to children, youth and families to address factors that have significantly affected the achievement of students.
- i. The SEA will ensure that assessment results are promptly provided to LEAs, schools, and teachers.
- j. The State will participate in State academic assessments of 4<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> grade reading and mathematics under NAEP if the Secretary pays the cost of administering such assessments, and will ensure that schools drawn for the NAEP sample will participate in all phases of these assessments, including having results published.
- k. The SEA, in consultation with the Governor, will produce a plan for carrying out the responsibilities of the State under sections 1116 and 1117, and the SEA's statewide system for technical assistance and support of LEAs.
- l. The SEA will assist LEAs in developing or identifying high-quality curricula aligned with State academic achievement standards and will disseminate such curricula to each LEA and local school within the State.
- m. The State will carry out the assurances specified in section 1111(c).

#### 1. Title I, Part B – Even Start Family Literacy

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will meet its indicators of program quality developed in section 1240.
- b. The SEA will help each project under this part to fully implement the program elements described in section 1235, including the monitoring of the projects' compliance with staff qualification requirements and usage of instructional programs based on scientifically based reading research for children and adults.

- c. The SEA collaborated with early childhood specialists, adult education specialists, and others at the State and local level with interests in family literacy in the development and implementation of this plan.

## 2. Title I, Part C – Education of Migrant Children

Assurance that –

In addition to meeting the seven program assurances in Section 1304(c), the SEA will ensure that –

- a. Special educational needs of migratory children, including preschool migratory children, are identified and addressed through – (a) the full range of services that are available for migratory children from appropriate local, State, and Federal educational programs; (b) joint planning among local, State, and Federal educational programs serving migrant children, including language instruction educational programs under part A or B of title III; and (c) the integration of services available under this part with services provided by those other programs, a (d) measurable program goals and outcomes.
- b. State and its local operating agencies will identify and address the special educational needs of migratory children in accordance with a comprehensive State plan as specified in section 1306 (a).
- c. State will provide for educational continuity through the timely transfer of pertinent school records in a manner consistent with procedures the Secretary may require.

## 4. Title I, Part D – Children and Youth Who Are Neglected, Delinquent or At-Risk

Assurance that the SEA –

- a. Will ensure that programs will be carried out in accordance with the State plan.
- b. Will carry out the evaluation requirements of section 1431.
- c. Has collaborated with parents, correctional facilities, local education agencies, public and private business and other state and federal technical and vocational programs in developing and implementing its plan to meet the educational needs of neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth.
- d. Conducts a process to award Subpart 2 subgrants, to programs operated by local education agencies and correctional facilities.
- e. Will integrate programs and services for neglected, delinquent, and at-risk children and youth with other programs under this Act or other Acts.

## 5. Title I, Part F – Comprehensive School Reform

Assurance that the SEA will --

- a. Fulfill all requirements relating to the competitive subgranting of program funds.
- b. Awards subgrants of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support the initial costs of the program.

- c. Award subgrants renewable for 2 additional one year periods if the school is making substantial progress.
- d. Consider the equitable distribution of subgrants to different geographic regions in the State, including urban and rural areas and to schools serving elementary and secondary students.
- e. Reserve not more than five (5) percent of grant funds for administrative, evaluation, and technical assistance expenses.
- f. Use funds to supplement, and not supplant, any other funds that would otherwise be available to carry out these activities.
- g. Report subgrant information, including names of LEAs and schools, amount of award, and description of award.
- h. Provide a copy of the State's annual program evaluation.

6. Title II, Part A – Teacher and Principal Training and Recruiting Fund

Assurance that –

- a. The SEA will take steps to ensure compliance with the requirements for “professional development” as the term is defined in section 9101(34).
- b. All funded activities will be developed collaboratively and based on the input of teachers, principals, administrators, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel.
- c. The SEA will implement the provisions for technical assistance and accountability in section 2141 with regard to any LEA that has failed to make adequate yearly progress for two or more consecutive years.

7. Title II, Part D – Enhanced Education Through Technology

Assurance that the SEA --

- a. Will ensure that each subgrant awarded under section 2412 (a)(2)(B) is of sufficient size and duration, and that the program funded by the subgrant is of sufficient scope and quality, to carry out the purposes of this part effectively.
- b. Has in place a State Plan for Educational Technology that meets all of the provisions of section 2413 of ESEA.

8. Title III, Part A – English Language Acquisition, Language Enhancement, and Academic Achievement

Assurance that --

- a. Subgrantees will be required to use their subgrants to build their capacity to continue to provide high-quality language instruction educational programs for LEP students once the subgrants are no longer available.
- b. The State will consult with LEAs, education-related community groups and non-profit organizations, parents, teachers, school administrators, and researchers in developing annual measurable student achievement objectives for subgrantees.
- c. Each subgrantee will include in its plan a certification that all teachers in a Title III language instruction educational program for limited English

proficient children are fluent in English and any other language used for instruction.

- d. In awarding subgrants to eligible entities that have experienced a recent significant increase in the percentage or number of immigrant students, the State will equally consider eligible entities that have limited or no experience in serving immigrant children and youth, and consider the quality of each local plan.
- e. Subgrants will be of sufficient size and scope to support high-quality programs.
- f. Subgrantees will be required to provide for an annual reading or language arts assessment in English of all children who have been in the United States for three or more consecutive years.
- g. Subgrantees will be required to assess annually the English proficiency of all LEP children.
- h. A subgrantee plan will not be in violation of any State law, including State constitutional law, regarding the education of LEP children.
- i. Subgrantee evaluations will be used to determine and improve the effectiveness of subgrantee programs and activities.
- j. Subgrantee evaluations will include a description of the progress made by children in meeting State academic content and student academic achievement standards for each of the two years after these children no longer participate in a Title III language instruction educational program.
- k. A subgrantee that fails to make progress toward meeting annual measurable achievement objectives for two consecutive years will be required to develop an improvement plan that will ensure the subgrantee meets those objectives.
- l. Subgrantees will be required to provide the following information to parents of LEP children selected for participation in a language instruction educational program:
  - 1) How the program will meet the educational needs of their children;
  - 2) Their options to decline to enroll their children in that program or to choose another program, if available;
  - 3) If applicable, the failure of the subgrantee to make progress on the annual measurable achievement objectives for their children.
- m. In awarding subgrants, the State will address the needs of school systems of all sizes and in all geographic areas within the State, including school systems with urban and rural schools.

#### 9. Title IV, Part A – Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities

Assurance that --

- a. The State has developed a comprehensive plan for the use of funds by the State educational agency and the chief executive officer of the State to provide safe, orderly, and drug-free schools and communities through programs and activities that complement and support activities of local educational agencies under section 4115(b), that comply with the principles of effectiveness under

section 4115(a), and that otherwise are in accordance with the purpose of this part.

- b. Activities funded under this program will foster a safe and drug-free learning environment that supports academic achievement.
- c. The application was developed in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials and others, including the chief executive officer, the chief State school officer, the head of the State alcohol and drug abuse agency, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies, the head of the State child welfare agency, the head of the State board of education, or their designees, and representatives of parents, students, and community-based organizations.
- d. Funds reserved under section 4112(a) will not duplicate the efforts of the State education agency and local educational agencies with regard to the provisions of school-based drug and violence prevention activities and that those funds will be used to serve populations not normally served by the State educational agencies and local educational agencies and populations that need special services, such as school dropouts, suspended and expelled students, youth in detention centers, runaway or homeless children and youth, and pregnant and parenting youth.
- e. The State will cooperate with, and assist, the Secretary in conducting data collection as required by section 4122.
- f. LEAs in the State will comply with the provisions of section 9501 pertaining to the participation of private school children and teachers in the programs and activities under this program.
- g. Funds under this program will be used to increase the level of State, local, and other non-Federal funds that would, in the absence of funds under this subpart, be made available for programs and activities authorized under this program, and in no case supplant such State, local, and other non-Federal funds.
- h. A needs assessment was conducted by the State for drug and violence prevention programs, which shall be based on ongoing State evaluation activities, including data on the incidence and prevalence of illegal drug use and violence among youth in schools and communities, including the age of onset, the perception of health risks, and the perception of social disapproval among such youth, the prevalence of protective factors, buffers, or assets and other variables in the school and community identified through scientifically based research.
- i. The State will develop and implement procedures for assessing and publicly reporting progress toward meeting the performance measures.
- j. The State application will be available for public review after submission of the application.
- k. Special outreach activities will be carried out by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to maximize the participation of community-based organizations of demonstrated effectiveness that provide services such as mentoring programs in low-income communities.

- l. Funds will be used by the SEA and the chief executive officer of the State to support, develop, and implement community-wide comprehensive drug and violence prevention planning and organizing activities.
- m. The State will develop a process for review of applications from local educational agencies that includes receiving input from parents.

#### 10. Title IV, Part B – 21<sup>st</sup> Century Community Learning Centers

Assure that the SEA will –

- a. Write the State application in consultation and coordination with appropriate State officials, including the chief State school officer, and other State agencies administering before and after school programs, the heads of the State health and mental health agencies or their designees, and representatives of teachers, parents, students, the business community, and community-based organizations.
- b. Award subgrants of not less than three years and not more than five years that are of not less than \$50,000 and of sufficient size and scope to support high quality, effective programs.
- c. Fund entities that propose to serve students who primarily attend schools eligible for schoolwide programs under section 1114 or schools that serve a high percentage of students from low-income families, and the families of such students.
- d. Require local applicants to submit a plan describing how community learning centers to be funded through this grant will continue after the grant period.
- e. Require local applicants to describe in their applications how the transportation needs of participating students will be addressed.

#### 11. Title V, Part A – Innovative Programs

Assure that --

- a. The State has set forth the allocation of funds required to implement section 5142 (participation of children enrolled in private schools).
- b. The State has made provision for timely public notice and public dissemination of the information concerning allocations of funds required to implement provisions for assistance to students attending private schools.
- c. Apart from providing technical and advisory assistance and monitoring compliance with this part, the SEA has not exercised, and will not exercise, any influence in the decision making processes of LEAs as to the expenditure made pursuant to the LEAs' application for program funds submitted under section 5133.

## **APPENDIX**



Attachment 1a.

***Draft Proposal: TIMELINE OF MAJOR MILESTONES FOR ADOPTING CHALLENGING GRADE LEVEL CONTENT STANDARDS IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS AND MATHEMATICS (KINDERGARTEN THROUGH 10)***

ESEA Title I Requirements	Action Steps	Proposed Timeframe	Evidence/Documentation
State Academic Content Standards in <b>Reading/Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> at each grade level (3-8) or the dissemination of grade level expectations for <b>Reading/Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grades 3-8)	1.) Formation of standards review and articulation committees (comprised of educators from around the State) for each grade level (K-10) in <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b>  2.) Standards review and articulation process for <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (K-10)  3.) Draft grade level standards in <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (K-10)  4.) Community group reviews of draft standards  5.) Submission of grade level standards in <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> to Arizona State Board of Education for adoption  6.) Dissemination of grade level standards in <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> to the public	1.) June 2002  2.) July 2002  3.) Summer 2002  4.) Summer 2002  5.) Fall 2002  6.) Fall 2003	1.) List of committee members  2.) Notes of meetings  3.) Final Draft of grade level content standards (K-10)  4.) Transcripts of reviews  5.) Minutes; approved draft of grade level content standards  6.) Website

Attachment 1b.

***Draft Proposal: TIMELINE OF MAJOR MILESTONES FOR ADOPTING CHALLENGING GRADE LEVEL CONTENT STANDARDS IN SCIENCE (KINDERGARTEN THROUGH GRADE 10)***

ESEA Title I Requirements	Action Steps	Expected Timeframe	Evidence/Documentation
<p>State Academic Content Standards in <b>Science</b> at each grade level (3-8) or the dissemination of grade level expectations for <b>Science</b> (grades 3-8)</p> <p>➤ Implement Science content Standards by 2005-2006 academic year</p>	<p>1.) Formation of standards review and articulation committees (comprised of educators from around the State) for each grade level (K-10) in <b>Science</b></p> <p>2.) Standards review and articulation process for <b>Science</b> (K-10)</p> <p>3.) Draft grade level standards in <b>Science</b> (K-10)</p> <p>4.) Community group reviews of draft standards.</p> <p>5.) Submission of grade level standards in <b>Science</b> to Arizona State Board of Education for adoption</p> <p>6.) Dissemination of grade level standards in <b>Science</b> to the public</p>	<p>1.) October 2002</p> <p>2.) November 2002</p> <p>3.) Winter 2002</p> <p>4.) Winter 2002</p> <p>5.) February/March 2002</p> <p>6.) Spring 2003</p>	<p>1.) List of committee members</p> <p>2.) Notes</p> <p>3.) Final Draft of grade level content standards (K-10)</p> <p>4.) Transcripts of reviews</p> <p>5.) Minutes; approved draft of grade level content standards</p> <p>6.) Website</p>

Attachment 1c.

***Draft Proposal: TIMELINE OF MAJOR MILESTONES FOR DEVELOPMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION OF ASSESSMENTS THAT MEET THE REQUIREMENTS OF SECTION 1111 (b)(3)***

<b>ESEA Title I Requirements</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Expected Timeframe</b>
<p>2001-2002 annual testing of <b>Reading/ Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> at least once in grades 3-5, grades 6-9 and grades (currently assessed by AIMS)</p> <p>2005-2006 annual testing of <b>Reading/ Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> in each grade (3-8) and once in grades 10-12</p> <p>2007-2008 add a test of <b>Science</b> at least one in grades 3-5, grades 6-9 and grades 10-12</p>	<p>1.) Test blueprints for Reading, Writing and Mathematics (AIMS//grades 3, 5, 8 and 10)<sup>14</sup></p> <p>2.) RFP Published for current contract</p> <p>3.) National Technical Advisory Committee meeting.</p> <p>4.) Independent review of AIMS and validity study</p> <p>5.) Review standards and articulate across grades K-10 for <b>Reading, Mathematics and Science</b></p> <p>6.) Final determination of assessment(s)<sup>15</sup></p> <p>7.) Item development for <b>Reading</b> (2, 4, 6 and 7) and <b>Mathematics</b> (4, 6 and 7) [Formation of item writing committees with representation from LEAs]</p>	<p>1.) Summer 1997</p> <p>2.) Summer 2001</p> <p>3.) June 2002 (Meets twice a year)</p> <p>4.) Summer-Fall 2002</p> <p>5.) July (Reading and Math) and November (Science) 2002</p> <p>6.) Fall 2002/Winter 2003 (Tentative)</p> <p>7.) Spring 2003</p>

<sup>14</sup> Item and test specifications (blueprints) for the development of test forms that will contain State owned, teacher developed item/bank items for future test administrations will be complete by 2004.

<sup>15</sup> Depending on the final determination of assessment(s), the ADE will consider modifications to current contract for additional assessment development.

	8.) Item bank refreshment for Reading, Writing and Mathematics (3, 5, 8 and 10)	8.) Spring 2003
	9.) Live test administration for Reading, Writing and <b>Mathematics</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10); completed administrators' manual; completed administrators' manual.	9.) Spring 2003
	10.) Full Item Review	10.) Summer 2003
	11.) Submit to U.S. Department of Education evidence of assessment system's technical quality [report] (alignment of Stanford 9 and AIMS as a unit, to the academic standards, reliability and validity of the tests and the rigor of performance standards) <b>Technical reports/manuals will be completed 6-9 months following each live administration of assessments.</b>	11.) Summer 2003
	12.) Field testing for <b>Reading</b> (2, 4, 6 and 7) and <b>Mathematics</b> (4, 6 and 7)	12.) Spring 2004
	13.) Item bank refreshment at all grades ( <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> )	13.) Spring 2004
	14.) Live test administration for <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10); complete administrators' manual.	14.) Spring 2004
	15.) Full Item Review	15.) Summer 2004

	16.) Live test administration for <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> (grade 10 only) [State Board policy//graduation requirement]; completed administrators' manual.	16.)Fall 2004
	17.) Live test administration for <b>Reading</b> (2-8 and 10), <b>Mathematics</b> (3-8 and 10) and <b>Writing</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10)	17.)Spring 2005
	18.) Further item development for <b>Science</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10) and <b>Reading and Mathematics</b> (grade 9 only) [Formulation of item writing committees with representation from LEAs]	18.)Spring 2005
	19.) Item bank refreshment at all grades ( <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> )	19.)Spring 2005
	20.) Full Item Review	20.)Summer 2005
	21.) Live test administration for <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> (grade 10 only); complete administrators' manual.	21.)Fall 2005
	22.) Live test administration <b>Reading</b> (2-8 and 10), <b>Mathematics</b> (3-8 and 10) and <b>Writing</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10); complete administrators manual.	22.)Spring 2006
	23.) Field testing for <b>Science</b> (3, 5, 8 and 10) and <b>Reading and Mathematics</b> (9)	23.)Spring 2006
	24.) Item bank refreshment at all grades (all subjects)	24.)Spring 2006

	25.) Live test administration for <b>Reading, Writing and Mathematics</b> (grade 10 only); complete administrators' manual.	25.)Fall 2006
	26.) Live test administration // full battery (fully compliant with ESEA assessment requirements)	26.)Spring 2007

**Attachment 1d.**

***Draft Proposal: TIMELINE OF MAJOR MILESTONES FOR SETTING, IN CONSULTATION WITH LEAS, ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT STANDARDS IN READING/LANGUAGE ARTS, MATHEMATICS AND SCIENCE***

<b>ESEA Title I Requirements</b>	<b>Action Steps</b>	<b>Expected Timeframe</b>	<b>Evidence//Documentation</b>
State Achievement Standards in <b>Reading/Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grades 3, 5, 8 and 10)	1.) Review of State Achievement Standards in <b>Reading, Writing</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grades 3, 5, 8 and 10) by National Technical Advisory Committee	1.) June 2002	1.) Report
State Achievement Standards in <b>Reading/Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grade 3-8) implemented by 2005-2006 academic year	2.) Operational assessment(s) in <b>Reading</b> (grades 2-8 and 10) Student data available: summer 2005.	2.) Spring 2005	2.) Test results; reports
	3.) Operational assessment(s) in <b>Mathematics</b> (grades 3-8 and 10) Student data available: summer 2005.	3.) Spring 2005	3.) Test results; reports
State Achievement Standards in <b>Reading/Language Arts</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grade spans 3-5,6-9 and 10-12) implemented by 2007-2008 academic year	4.) Formation of achievement standards setting committees (with representatives from LEAs) for <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b>	4.) Spring 2005	4.) List of committee members; cut score documentation
	5.) Review, analysis, setting Process (achievement labels) and drafting of level descriptors ( <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> )	5.) Spring 2005	5.) Descriptors by grade level

	<p>6.) Submission of achievement standards to the Arizona State Board of Education for adoption</p> <p>7.) Operational assessment(s) in <b>Science</b> (grades 3, 5, 8 and 10) and <b>Reading</b> and <b>Mathematics</b> (grade 9 only) student data available: Summer 2007</p> <p>8.) Formation of achievement standards setting committee (with representatives from LEAs) for <b>Science, Reading</b> (9) and <b>Mathematics</b> (9)</p> <p>9.) Review, analysis, setting process (achievement labels) and drafting of level descriptors for Science, Reading (9) and Mathematics (9).</p> <p>10.) Submission of achievement standards to the Arizona State Board of Education for adoption</p>	<p>6.) Summer/Fall 2005</p> <p>7.) Spring 2007</p> <p>8.) Spring 2007</p> <p>9.) Spring 2007</p> <p>10.) Summer/Fall 2007</p>	<p>6.) Adopted draft</p> <p>7.) Test results; reports</p> <p>8.) List of committee members; cut score documentation</p> <p>9.) Descriptors by grade level</p> <p>10.) Adopted draft</p>
--	--	---	---





LANGUAGE	# OF SPEAKERS
ENGLISH	615,164
SPANISH	169,993
NAVAJO	15,435
OTHER NON-INDIAN	4,409
VIETNAMESE	2,046
APACHE-SAN CARLOS	1,357
ARABIC	1,331
APACHE-WHITERIVER	1,177
TOHONO O'ODHAM (PAPAGO)	1,123
KOREAN	1,010
HOPI	839
MANDARIN	832
CANTONESE	817
ROMANIAN	761
FILIPINO	686
RUSSIAN	573
GERMAN	494
OTHER INDIAN	458
FRENCH	419
YUGOSLAVIAN	386
CAMBODIAN	380
HUALAPAI	377
PIMA	377
JAPANESE	358

**Attachment 2 Languages Present in Arizona's Student Population  
(2001-2002) Arizona Language Census and Program Report (ALCAP)**

## Department of Education

### Agency Summary

JLBC: Steve Schimpf  
OSP: Dawn Nazary

Honorable Lisa Graham Keegan, Superintendent of Public Instruction

House Subcommittee: Gray

Senate Subcommittee: Hamilton

DESCRIPTION	FY 2000	FY 2001	FY 2002		FY 2003	
	ACTUAL	ESTIMATE	OSP	JLBC	OSP	JLBC
<b>PROGRAM BUDGET</b>						
General Services Administration	15,495,200	15,723,000	16,495,700	14,224,900	17,293,000	14,685,700
Assistance to Schools	2,429,705,800	2,507,312,000	2,948,438,100	2,992,275,800	3,131,039,000	3,173,608,000
<b>AGENCY TOTAL</b>	<b>2,445,201,000</b>	<b>2,523,035,000</b>	<b>2,964,933,800</b>	<b>3,006,500,700</b>	<b>3,148,332,000</b>	<b>3,188,293,700</b>

### OPERATING BUDGET

<i>Full Time Equivalent Positions</i>	202.7	202.7	222.7	224.7	222.7	224.7
Personal Services	3,582,900	4,376,400	4,374,800	4,486,800	4,374,800	4,486,800
Employee Related Expenditures	741,200	867,500	825,100	918,800	828,700	918,800
All Other Operating Expenditures:						
Professional and Outside Services	591,500	93,500	94,300	93,500	94,300	93,500
Travel - In State	52,200	66,600	66,600	69,600	66,600	69,600
Travel - Out of State	31,300	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
Other Operating Expenditures	1,173,200	1,170,500	1,151,400	1,220,600	1,150,200	1,218,500
Equipment	129,500	0	0	0	0	0
OPERATING SUBTOTAL	6,301,800	6,599,500	6,537,200	6,814,300	6,539,600	6,812,200
Special Line Items	2,438,899,200	2,516,435,500	2,958,396,600	2,999,686,400	3,141,792,400	3,181,481,500
<b>AGENCY TOTAL</b>	<b>2,445,201,000</b>	<b>2,523,035,000</b>	<b>2,964,933,800</b>	<b>3,006,500,700</b>	<b>3,148,332,000</b>	<b>3,188,293,700</b>

### FUND SOURCES

General Fund	2,382,662,300	2,450,928,800	2,578,190,600	2,600,203,200	2,722,451,400	2,745,282,500
General Fund - Dedicated	0	0	305,223,600	328,210,000	331,315,100	361,110,200
Permanent State School Fund	61,591,200	71,136,100	74,898,300	74,898,300	74,898,300	74,898,300
Permanent State School Fund - Dedicated	0	0	5,567,500	2,204,400	18,614,500	6,017,700
Teacher Certification Fund	947,500	970,100	1,053,800	984,800	1,052,700	985,000
SUBTOTAL - Other Appropriated Funds	62,538,700	72,106,200	386,743,200	406,297,500	425,880,600	443,011,200
<b>SUBTOTAL - Appropriated Funds</b>	<b>2,445,201,000</b>	<b>2,523,035,000</b>	<b>2,964,933,800</b>	<b>3,006,500,700</b>	<b>3,148,332,000</b>	<b>3,188,293,700</b>
Other Non-Appropriated Funds	1,511,700	1,307,100	3,567,100	3,567,100	7,438,500	7,438,500
Federal Funds	444,621,600	458,102,700	434,291,900	434,291,900	434,103,500	434,103,500
<b>TOTAL - ALL SOURCES</b>	<b>2,891,334,300</b>	<b>2,982,444,800</b>	<b>3,402,792,800</b>	<b>3,444,359,700</b>	<b>3,589,874,000</b>	<b>3,629,835,700</b>

### CHANGE IN FUNDING SUMMARY

	FY 2001 to FY 2002 JLBC		FY 2001 to FY 2003 JLBC		Biennial
	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change	% Change	\$ Change
General Fund	149,274,400	6.1%	294,353,700	12.0%	443,628,100
General Fund - Dedicated	328,210,000	NA	361,110,200	NA	689,320,200
Other Appropriated Funds	3,776,900	5.2%	3,777,100	5.2%	7,554,000
Other Appropriated Funds - Dedicated	2,204,400	NA	6,017,700	NA	8,222,100
Total Appropriated Funds	483,465,700	19.2%	665,258,700	26.4%	1,148,724,400

**AGENCY DESCRIPTION** — The Department of Education is headed by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, an elected constitutional officer. For FY 2002 and FY 2003 it is anticipated that the department will oversee 228 school districts and at least 190 charter schools in their provision of public education from preschool through grade 12.



State of Arizona  
Department of Education

April 15, 2002

Jaime A. Molera  
Superintendent of  
Public Instruction

Dr. Glenn Irvin, Co-Chair  
Dr. Richard Duran, Co-Chair  
Academic Program Articulation Steering Committee  
C/O Arizona State University West  
Post Office Box 37100, MC 1251  
Phoenix, AZ 85069

Dear Drs. Irvin and Duran:

On behalf of the Arizona Department of Education and as a member of the Teacher Education Partnership Commission, I offer this letter of support and endorsement for the development of a Statewide Associate Degree for the preparation of paraprofessionals and pre-service teacher preparation students. The development and offering of this degree supports the on-going state efforts to increase the quantity of quality teachers in Arizona's classrooms.

I particularly support the opportunity to develop a standards-based approach to lower-division preparation that is aligned with the Statewide Teaching Standards. A common approach across the state will provide strong preparation for entering paraprofessionals, strengthen the recruitment opportunities, and improve opportunities for quality alternative certification for employed paraprofessionals.

I hope your discussion of this important item is successful at your April meeting. You have a great opportunity to respond to the statewide need for quality teachers for all Arizona students through the offering of a Statewide Associate Degree at the ten community college districts throughout the state.

Sincerely,

Ralph D. Romero, CFM  
Deputy Associate Superintendent  
Department of Education  
rromero@ade.az.gov  
(602) 542-7462

1535 West Jefferson, Phoenix, Arizona 85007 • (602) 542-4361 • [www.ade.az.gov](http://www.ade.az.gov)

**Attachment #4**